1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	x
3	ESTHER KIOBEL, INDIVIDUALLY AND :
4	ON BEHALF OF HER LATE HUSBAND, :
5	DR. BARINEM KIOBEL, ET AL., : No. 10-1491
6	Petitioners :
7	v. :
8	ROYAL DUTCH PETROLEUM CO., ET AL. :
9	x
10	Washington, D.C.
11	Tuesday, February 28, 2012
12	
13	The above-entitled matter came on for oral
14	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
15	at 10:02 a.m.
16	APPEARANCES:
17	PAUL HOFFMAN, ESQ., Venice, California; on behalf of
18	Petitioners.
19	EDWIN S. KNEEDLER, ESQ., Deputy Solicitor General,
20	Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; for United
21	States, as amicus curiae, supporting Petitioners.
22	KATHLEEN M. SULLIVAN, ESQ., New York, New York; on
23	behalf of Respondents.
24	
25	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	PAUL HOFFMAN, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	EDWIN S. KNEEDLER, ESQ.	
7	For United States, as amicus curiae,	15
8	supporting Petitioners	
9	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
10	KATHLEEN M. SULLIVAN, ESQ.	
11	On behalf of the Respondents	24
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
13	PAUL HOFFMAN, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of the Petitioners	52
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(10:02 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument
4	first this morning in Case 10-1491, Kiobel v. Royal
5	Dutch Petroleum.
6	Mr. Hoffman.
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF PAUL HOFFMAN
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
9	MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
10	please the Court:
11	The principal issue before this Court is the
12	narrow issue of whether a corporation can ever be held
13	liable for violating fundamental human rights norms
14	under the Alien Tort Statute. Under Respondents' view,
15	even if these corporations had jointly operated torture
16	centers with the military dictatorship in Nigeria to
17	detain, torture, and kill all opponents of Shell's
18	operations in Ogoni, the victims would have no claim.
19	JUSTICE KENNEDY: But, counsel, for me, the
20	case turns in large part on this: page 17 of the red
21	brief. It says, "International law does not recognize
22	corporate responsibility for the alleged offenses here.
23	And the one of the the amicus brief
24	for Chevron says, "No other nation in the world permits
25	its court to exercise universal civil jurisdiction over

- 1 alleged extraterritorial human rights abuses to which
- 2 the nation has no connection."
- And in reading through the briefs, I was
- 4 trying to find the best authority you have to refute
- 5 that proposition, or are you going to say that that
- 6 proposition is irrelevant?
- 7 MR. HOFFMAN: Well, there -- there are a
- 8 couple of questions within that.
- 9 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And it -- it involves your
- 10 whole argument, of course.
- MR. HOFFMAN: It does. Yes.
- 12 (Laughter.)
- MR. HOFFMAN: And -- and let me start by
- 14 saying that the international human rights norms that
- 15 are at the basis of this case for the plaintiffs --
- 16 crimes against humanity, torture, prolonged arbitrary
- 17 detention, extrajudicial executions -- all of those
- 18 human rights norms are defined by actions. They're not
- 19 defined by whether the perpetrator is a human being or a
- 20 corporation or another kind of entity.
- 21 And so, I think that the -- the Respondents
- 22 are wrong when they say that international law does not
- 23 extend to -- to those kinds of acts. They do -- it
- 24 does. And the United States agrees with that position.
- 25 What they have tried to -- to conflate is

- 1 the question about whether international law -- the
- 2 international law norms apply to a corporation or a
- 3 person with whether there's a -- an international
- 4 consensus with respect to how those norms should be
- 5 enforced, particularly within domestic civil
- 6 jurisdiction as opposed to criminal jurisdiction.
- 7 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But in -- in the area of
- 8 international criminal law, which is just analogous, I
- 9 recognize, there is a distinction made between
- 10 individuals and corporations.
- MR. HOFFMAN: Well, there's a distinction
- 12 made within the jurisdiction of certain modern
- 13 international criminal tribunals. And Respondents take
- 14 their position too far in this, because what they've
- 15 said is that the fact that corporations can't be found
- 16 liable criminally under the International Criminal
- 17 Court, for example, means that the norms, the underlying
- 18 norms -- genocide, crimes against humanity, and war
- 19 crimes when it comes to the International Criminal
- 20 Court -- don't apply to corporations.
- 21 And that's -- that clearly is wrong because
- 22 the United Kingdom and Netherlands, for example, the two
- 23 home countries of -- of these corporations has passed
- 24 domestic implementing legislation that imposes criminal
- 25 penalties for violations of those very norms. So,

- 1 there's no question that it can be done.
- 2 What the most important -- I think one of
- 3 the most important principles in this case is that
- 4 international law, from the time of the Founders to
- 5 today, uses domestic tribunals, domestic courts and
- 6 domestic legislation, as the primary engines to enforce
- 7 international law.
- 8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Hoffman --
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You began by --
- 10 by --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Hoffman, I -- I
- 12 thought that Justice Kennedy asked you, is there another
- 13 nation that has a counterpart to 1350 that imposes civil
- 14 liability on corporations for violations of customary
- international law, whether the conduct occurred abroad,
- 16 the harmed person is employed, and the defendant is not
- 17 a U.S. resident?
- MR. HOFFMAN: Well, the -- there are two
- 19 parts to -- to my answer to that. One is that the Alien
- 20 Tort Statute is a -- is a unique way of enforcing the
- 21 law of nations, in terms of the way that the Founders
- 22 married tort law and violations of the law of nations.
- 23 In the international human rights amicus
- 24 brief, the amicus brief of international human rights
- 25 organizations, at pages 18 to 22, there's a whole series

- 1 of cases where the domestic courts and domestic
- 2 legislation of various states around the world have
- 3 addressed those kinds of issues. And so, there isn't an
- 4 exact analogue to the Alien Tort Statute, but there's no
- 5 question that domestic legislation and domestic courts
- 6 have taken on these kinds of issues.
- 7 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, there's no particular
- 8 connection between the events here and the United
- 9 States. So, I think the question is whether there's any
- 10 other country in the world where these plaintiffs could
- 11 have brought these claims against the Respondents.
- 12 MR. HOFFMAN: Well, let me address the -- I
- 13 think this comes under the general rubric of
- 14 extraterritoriality.
- 15 JUSTICE ALITO: But is there a yes or no
- 16 answer to that question or not?
- 17 MR. HOFFMAN: I believe that they -- that
- 18 the answer to that would be yes.
- 19 JUSTICE ALITO: Where?
- MR. HOFFMAN: I think that they could be
- 21 brought in Holland or the United Kingdom for events in
- 22 Nigeria. I think that the cases that are discussed as
- 23 those --
- JUSTICE ALITO: Any other country other than
- 25 the country of the citizenship of the defendants?

- 1 MR. HOFFMAN: I don't know if this precise
- 2 case could be brought. I know that the -- we have a
- 3 principle of transitory torts, and so, one -- and I
- 4 believe other countries have that principle as well.
- 5 So, in terms of the underlying tort action, we have
- 6 plaintiffs who are U.S. residents and were U.S.
- 7 residents when they filed this case. They found a
- 8 tortfeasor within the United States that they believe
- 9 was responsible for these torts, and from Mostyn v.
- 10 Fabrigas and before, Mostyn v. Fabrigas being the 1774
- 11 case by Lord Mansfield talking about transitory tort,
- 12 the courts clearly have the jurisdiction to adjudicate
- 13 those kinds of tort claims.
- 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: If -- if there is no
- 15 other country where this suit could have been brought,
- 16 regardless of what American domestic law provides, isn't
- 17 it a legitimate concern that allowing the suit itself
- 18 contravenes international law?
- 19 MR. HOFFMAN: Well, that -- that issue has
- 20 been raised in a number of the briefs. I would say two
- 21 things: One is that that doesn't really go to the
- 22 question about whether corporations can be categorically
- 23 excluded from Alien Tort Statute coverage, which is
- 24 really the issue that -- that was decided by the court
- 25 below and which was the question presented here.

- 1 Extraterritoriality has to do with a different kind of
- 2 issue. I would argue that -- I mean, we've obviously
- 3 argued that that's an issue that ought to be briefed on
- 4 its own.
- 5 But there is no international law principle
- 6 that I am aware of, and I think it would need to be
- 7 proved, that says that the United States Congress was
- 8 disempowered at its founding from providing these kinds
- 9 of tort remedies. And it was clear from the founding
- 10 that the Founders at least believed that this statute
- 11 would be extraterritorial.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But it was
- 13 motivated, I gather, by assaults on ambassadors here
- 14 within the United States.
- MR. HOFFMAN: Well, it was motivated by the
- 16 Marbois incident and a similar incident to -- with
- 17 regard to a Dutch ambassador in New York at the time of
- 18 the Constitutional Convention. But if -- if the Court
- 19 looked to the Bradford incident -- the incident about
- 20 which Attorney General Bradford expressed his opinion in
- 21 1795, which was an opinion that this Court found very
- 22 important in terms of -- of interpreting the Alien Tort
- 23 Statute, the Bradford opinion had to do with an assault
- 24 on the British colony in Sierra Leone. And so, it was
- 25 not only extraterritorial in the sense of piracy, and I

- 1 think everybody agrees that -- that this statute was
- 2 intended to deal with piracy and maritime-related
- 3 violations of the law of nations.
- 4 It -- the Bradford opinion there said, even
- 5 though U.S. criminal jurisdiction was limited, the civil
- 6 jurisdiction under the Alien Tort Statute provided that
- 7 the corporation that -- whose property was attacked
- 8 within the territory of Sierra Leone --
- 9 JUSTICE ALITO: Have all the judges who have
- 10 interpreted that opinion interpreted it the way you just
- 11 did?
- MR. HOFFMAN: The Bradford opinion?
- 13 JUSTICE ALITO: Yes.
- 14 MR. HOFFMAN: I'm not sure in which sense.
- 15 I mean, the -- yes, the -- I think that the Bradford
- 16 opinion has been used --
- 17 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, what did -- how did
- 18 Judge Kavanaugh interpret that on the D.C. Circuit?
- 19 MR. HOFFMAN: Well, I think -- I don't
- 20 recall specifically. I know that there has been some
- 21 controversy about whether that was an attack in the high
- 22 seas. I know there's some scholarship about that. What
- 23 I would suggest to the Court, if the Court went back to
- 24 the original documents that that the -- that were sent
- 25 to Attorney General Bradford which -- from the British

- 1 government, I think the Court would find that -- that
- 2 this attack actually took place in the territory of
- 3 Sierra Leone.
- 4 And so, one of the reasons that we've
- 5 suggested that -- that -- that the extraterritoriality
- 6 issue deserves full treatment if the Court is troubled
- 7 by it, in a case where there is full briefing, because
- 8 in this case it was raised by the -- by -- by the
- 9 Respondents' amici largely, although the Respondents
- 10 have raised it, and there -- the historians that have
- 11 expressed opinions on corporate liability and others
- 12 that would be interested in this question have not been
- 13 able to put the other side before the Court.
- And I think there's a very -- there are very
- 15 important --
- 16 JUSTICE ALITO: The first sentence in your
- 17 brief and the statement of the case is really striking:
- 18 "This case was filed by 12 Nigerian Plaintiffs who
- 19 alleged that Respondents aided and abetted the human
- 20 rights violations committed against them by the Abacha
- 21 dictatorship in Nigeria between 1992 and 1995." What
- 22 does a case like that -- what business does a case like
- 23 that have in the courts of the United States?
- MR. HOFFMAN: Well --
- 25 JUSTICE ALITO: There's no connection to the

- 1 United States whatsoever.
- The Alien Tort Statute was enacted, it seems
- 3 to be -- there seems to be a consensus, to prevent the
- 4 United States -- to prevent international tension, to --
- 5 and -- does this -- and this kind of a lawsuit only
- 6 creates international tension.
- 7 MR. HOFFMAN: Well, the Alien -- if I could
- 8 start with the second part first. The Alien Tort
- 9 Statute certainly was passed to do that, but also as an
- 10 expression of the Nation's commitment to international
- 11 law, I think primarily as a -- as statement of this
- 12 country's commitment to international law as a new
- 13 member of the community of nations. And if -- if you
- 14 look at the incidents like the Marbois incident or --
- 15 JUSTICE ALITO: Do you really that think the
- 16 first Congress wanted victims of the French Revolution
- 17 to be able to sue in -- in the court -- to sue French
- 18 defendants in the courts of the United States?
- 19 MR. HOFFMAN: I think that what -- I think
- 20 the question would have been, is there a law of nations
- 21 violation? For example, in the Marbois incident, say
- 22 the -- Marbois was -- was attacked by Longchamps outside
- 23 the United States, but Longchamps came to take refuge in
- 24 the United States, and the French government said you
- 25 have somebody living in your country that has attacked

- 1 our ambassador in violation of the law of nations.
- I think the United States -- I think the
- 3 same principle -- the United States would have wanted to
- 4 do something for the French government in response to
- 5 that, because it would have been giving refuge to
- 6 someone who had violated the law of nations. And -- and
- 7 the same principle has been applied in the modern era to
- 8 -- to giving no safe haven to torturers and others.
- 9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: That sounds --
- 10 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Hoffman, could I --
- 11 JUSTICE GINSBURG: That sounds very much
- 12 like Filartiga. And I thought that -- that Sosa
- 13 accepted that Filartiga would be a viable action under
- 14 the tort claims act. So, I thought what we were talking
- 15 about today, the question was is it only individual
- 16 defendants or are corporate defendants also liable?
- 17 MR. HOFFMAN: A lot of the
- 18 extraterritoriality issues would apply to the cases that
- 19 this Court endorsed in Sosa.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: But I agree that we can
- 21 assume that Filartiga is a binding and important
- 22 precedent for the Second Circuit. But in that case the
- 23 only place they could sue was in the United States. He
- 24 was an individual. He was walking down the streets of
- 25 New York, and the victim saw him walking down the

- 1 streets of New York and brought the suit.
- In this case, the corporations have
- 3 residences and presence in many other countries where
- 4 they have much more -- many more contacts than here.
- 5 MR. HOFFMAN: And those issues, generally
- 6 speaking, are resolved by other doctrines rather than an
- 7 exclusion of corporations categorically from the
- 8 statute.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Can I go back to -- are you
- 10 finished with that answer?
- 11 MR. HOFFMAN: I was -- the only thing I was
- 12 going to add to that is that a doctrine like forum non
- 13 conveniens or personal jurisdiction would deal with the
- 14 issues about whether this is the most appropriate forum.
- 15 And those doctrines apply whether it's an Alien Tort
- 16 Statute case or it's a common law tort case.
- 17 These plaintiffs could bring this case in
- 18 State court. What the Alien Tort Statute does is
- 19 provide a federal forum when these torts are in
- 20 violation of the law of nations. And that's really what
- 21 it -- what the Founders intended and what -- and what it
- does.
- I'm sorry.
- JUSTICE BREYER: I just want some
- 25 clarification on the first question that Justice Kennedy

- 1 asked. Well -- I'll get it in reading about it. You go
- 2 ahead. You want to reserve your time. I can find the
- 3 answer to what I was going to ask.
- 4 MR. HOFFMAN: If there aren't any further
- 5 questions right now, I'd reserve the balance of my time.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 7 Mr. Hoffman.
- 8 Mr. Kneedler.
- 9 ORAL ARGUMENT OF EDWIN S. KNEEDLER,
- 10 FOR UNITED STATES, AS AMICUS CURIAE,
- 11 SUPPORTING THE PETITIONERS
- MR. KNEEDLER: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 13 please the Court:
- 14 The court of appeals erred in its
- 15 categorical ruling that a corporation may never be held
- 16 liable under the Alien Tort Statute regardless of the
- 17 nature of the norm, the locus of the wrong, or the
- 18 involvement of the state.
- 19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Kneedler, could you
- 20 explain to me the -- the difference between respondeat
- 21 superior liability and corporate liability? In -- in
- 22 the briefs there seems to be an assumption that
- 23 respondeat superior liability is -- is permissible, and
- 24 the only issue is whether corporate liability is. Is
- 25 there a difference between the two doctrines?

1	MR. KNEEDLER: Well, I think the difference
2	is really a matter of degree. I mean, under respondeat
3	superior liability, a corporation is normally
4	responsible, liable for the acts of its agents.
5	Judge Posner in the Seventh Circuit Flomo
6	decision suggested that in the nature in this
7	category of cases, assuming that the ATS would allow a
8	common law cause of action for conduct in another
9	country, that maybe there should be more limited
10	respondeat superior limited principles because the
11	action would occur in circumstances were the corporation
12	sought to be held liable may not have much much
13	control over it.
14	Where the corporation itself is liable
15	and this would be true in criminal law and presumably in
16	in tort law would usually require some action by
17	those responsible for running the corporation or high
18	enough up the chain of command
19	JUSTICE KAGAN: But, Mr. Kneedler, when
20	vou

- 21 MR. KNEEDLER: -- that policy --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Excuse me.
- MR. KNEEDLER: I'm sorry.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: When you say in your brief
- 25 that we should look at this as a remedial question, as a

- 1 question of enforcement, do you say that because you're
- 2 thinking of this as a vicarious liability case? In
- 3 other words, there's an individual person who clearly
- 4 has violated a norm of international law, and then the
- 5 question of whether to hold the corporation liable is an
- 6 enforcement question; or would you say that it's also an
- 7 enforcement question when we're talking about direct
- 8 corporate liability?
- 9 MR. KNEEDLER: I -- I think it's both.
- 10 Particularly the latter, but I think the former as well.
- 11 As Mr. Hoffman said, international law norms proscribe
- 12 certain conduct, but the enforcement of that is left to
- 13 each nation.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, but -- but I find it
- 15 difficult to understand why we -- we would not hold
- 16 foreign sovereigns liable under this Act, that they're
- 17 excluded despite -- despite its language; and yet, we
- 18 cannot inquire whether persons other than sovereigns are
- 19 covered. What is -- what is the distinction between the
- 20 two?
- 21 MR. KNEEDLER: With respect to sovereigns, a
- 22 sovereign could not be held liable for -- at least for
- 23 conduct outside the United States, because of the
- 24 Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. That's -- that's what
- 25 this Court held in the Amerada Hess case. Within the

- 1 United States, if a foreign sovereign committed a tort,
- 2 the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, subject to certain
- 3 limitations, would allow --
- 4 JUSTICE KAGAN: But I think this --
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: This is more specific than
- 6 the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. It deals with a
- 7 much more narrow category of case. And I do not think
- 8 that the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act would be
- 9 interpreted to eliminate the sovereign's liability, if
- 10 indeed this statute provided for it.
- MR. KNEEDLER: Well, the court in Amerada
- 12 Hess did hold that, that -- and it made an important --
- 13 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes.
- 14 MR. KNEEDLER: It made a point that is
- 15 important to this case as well. It said that while the
- 16 Alien Tort Statute identifies who the plaintiff must
- 17 be -- the plaintiff must be an alien -- it does not
- 18 identify who the defendant may be, and that if there are
- 19 limitations on who the defendant may be, from other
- 20 sources of law and foreign sovereign immunity would be
- 21 one of them, then the suit could not go forward against
- 22 the foreign sovereign.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: But, Mr. Kneedler, in Sosa,
- 24 and this is the footnote 20, we said that the question
- 25 of whether you were a state actor or not a state actor

- 1 might be relevant to the question of whether there was a
- 2 substantive norm that applied to you. And I guess the
- 3 question here is why that same analysis doesn't apply to
- 4 the question of whether there is corporate liability.
- 5 In other words, is there a substantive norm that applied
- 6 to corporations?
- 7 Maybe there is, maybe there isn't, but that
- 8 that's the question as opposed to what you suggest in
- 9 your brief, that really we should just think of this as
- 10 a question of enforcement which is entirely up to
- 11 Federal common law.
- 12 And I guess the question is: Why think of
- 13 it as enforcement rather than as a substantive
- 14 obligation?
- MR. KNEEDLER: Well, first looking at
- 16 footnote 20 in -- in Sosa, it -- what the footnote says,
- 17 that a related consideration, meaning related to whether
- 18 the particular norm satisfies the criteria in Sosa, is
- 19 whether international law extends the scope of liability
- 20 for a violation of a given norm to the perpetrator being
- 21 sued. If the defendant is a private actor such as a
- 22 corporation or individual --
- 23 JUSTICE KAGAN: No, I'm not saying footnote
- 24 20 --
- MR. KNEEDLER: Right.

1	JUSTICE	KAGAN:	Ιt	addressed	а	different

- 2 question, but it's an analogous question. If the
- 3 question of whether non-state actors are part of the
- 4 substantive obligation question, why, too, isn't the
- 5 question of whether international law extends to
- 6 corporations?
- 7 MR. KNEEDLER: But -- because the state
- 8 actor aspect of it goes to the question of the conduct.
- 9 Does the conduct itself violate the norm?
- I think it's a -- but beyond that, it's
- 11 enforcement. I think it's important to bear in mind
- 12 that the Alien Tort Statute uses the word "tort." And
- 13 it's --
- 14 JUSTICE SCALIA: But it -- I didn't
- 15 understand the point you just made, that the sovereign
- 16 immunity part goes to -- to the conduct?
- 17 MR. KNEEDLER: Well, it goes to whether the
- 18 defendant can be sued, the sovereign immunity does.
- 19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Why doesn't the corporate
- 20 thing go precisely to the same question.
- 21 MR. KNEEDLER: Because there is no
- 22 independent prohibition in international law or domestic
- 23 law against suing a corporation the way there is for a
- 24 foreign sovereign. To the contrary --
- 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But whether -- I'm

- 1 sorry.
- 2 MR. KNEEDLER: I was just going to say, to
- 3 the contrary, at the time the Alien Tort Statute was
- 4 adopted, corporations could be held liable. This
- 5 Court's decision in Chandler recently surveyed the --
- 6 the law and corporations could be held liable in tort.
- 7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But under
- 8 international law, it is critically pertinent who's --
- 9 who's undertaking the conduct that is alleged to violate
- 10 international norms. If an individual private group
- 11 seizes a ship, it's piracy. If the navy does it, it's
- 12 not. Governmental torture violates international norms.
- 13 Private conduct does not.
- So, why doesn't the -- why isn't the same
- 15 pertinence -- your argument seems to be that all you
- 16 need to do is find an event, torture, piracy, whatever,
- 17 and then it's up to the domestic law whether or not
- 18 particular entities can be sued.
- 19 MR. KNEEDLER: I -- I think that's correct,
- 20 and --
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: As a statement of
- 22 your position.
- MR. KNEEDLER: Yes.
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But it doesn't work
- 25 when you're talking about state -- whether it's a state

- 1 conducting the illegal conduct or somebody else. So,
- 2 why -- that's not up to the domestic --
- 3 MR. KNEEDLER: No, because that goes to the
- 4 definition of the norm. But if we -- if we take -- if
- 5 we take the Alien Tort Statute, in 1907, the Attorney
- 6 General concluded that an irrigation company could be
- 7 sued for violating a treaty. If we take the examples
- 8 that gave rise to the Alien Tort Statute, if a process
- 9 serving company -- if one of its agents went into an
- 10 ambassador's house and tried to serve process, that was
- 11 a criminal violation at the time.
- 12 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But you go much -- you go
- 13 much further. Suppose an American corporation commits
- 14 human trafficking with U.S. citizens in the United
- 15 States. Under your view, the U.S. corporation could be
- 16 sued in any country in the world, and it would -- and
- 17 that would have no international consequences. We don't
- 18 look to the international consequences at all.
- 19 That's -- that's the view of the Government of the
- 20 United States, as I understand.
- 21 MR. KNEEDLER: No. The question of
- 22 extraterritorial application is distinct from the
- 23 question of whether a corporation can be held liable.
- JUSTICE BREYER: So -- so, why -- why
- 25 then -- you want to answer in your brief -- and this

- 1 question, I find impossibly difficult, maybe highly
- 2 fact-dependent. There is no United States Supreme Court
- 3 of the World. There is no way of getting unified law on
- 4 the points of whether when we interpret a common law
- 5 Federal -- a system of Federal common law to decide
- 6 whether a corporation can be defendant -- a defendant in
- 7 a certain kind of case. Every other country could do
- 8 the same. And there's no way of resolving it. All
- 9 right?
- 10 So, I find that a difficult question. I
- 11 don't know why that's in this case. I would have
- 12 thought the question in this case is, can a private
- 13 actor be sued for certain violations of -- of
- 14 substantive criminal law? The answer's "yes." Okay?
- 15 Genocide, for example.
- 16 And then the question is -- a corporation is
- 17 a private actor. And is there any reason why, just like
- 18 any other private actor, a corporation couldn't be sued
- 19 for genocide? And there the answer is I don't know, but
- 20 I'll find out when the other side argues. You see?
- 21 (Laughter.)
- JUSTICE BREYER: So, I -- I think this is
- 23 unnecessarily complicated. They made a -- a categorical
- 24 rule. They said never sue a corporation. I seem to
- 25 think possibly of counterexamples. Pirates,

- 2 MR. KNEEDLER: Right.
- JUSTICE BREYER: You know? I mean -- so --
- 4 so, why isn't that -- why are we going into -- I mean,
- 5 you have good reason for doing it, and I want to hear
- 6 why.
- 7 MR. KNEEDLER: Well, our -- our position is
- 8 straightforward. Just as you said, the question of
- 9 whether a corporation should be held liable we think
- 10 should be based on the fact that the ATS refers to
- 11 torts. And in applying -- this question we think is not
- 12 complicated.
- In fashioning Federal common law to decide
- 14 whether there should be a common law cause of action,
- 15 the ATS's reference to tort law, I think, directs the
- 16 Court to domestic tort law, and the question of whether
- 17 a corporation can be held liable under domestic tort
- 18 law. And it clearly can be. It could be at the time
- 19 this statute was enacted, and it can be today.
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 21 Mr. Kneedler.
- Ms. Sullivan.
- 23 ORAL ARGUMENT OF KATHLEEN M. SULLIVAN
- ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS
- 25 MS. SULLIVAN: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it

- 1 please the Court:
- 2 I'd like to begin with the answer to
- 3 Justice Kennedy's first question. Justice Kennedy asked
- 4 and Justice Breyer renewed the question, is there any
- 5 source in customary international law throughout the
- 6 world that holds corporations liable for the human
- 7 rights offenses alleged here?
- 8 And the answer is there is none.
- 9 JUSTICE BREYER: You say there is not a
- 10 case. That's a different matter.
- 11 MS. SULLIVAN: Not a case --
- 12 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes, but that's a different
- 13 matter because you can have a principle that applies
- 14 even though there isn't a case. And the principle that
- 15 here would apply is what I said, Pirates, Incorporated.
- 16 Do you think in the 18th century if they'd brought
- 17 Pirates, Incorporated, and we get all their gold, and
- 18 Blackbeard gets up and he says, oh, it isn't me; it's
- 19 the corporation -- do you think that they would have
- 20 then said: Oh, I see, it's a corporation. Good-bye.
- 21 Go home.
- 22 (Laughter.)
- 23 MS. SULLIVAN: Justice Breyer, yes, the
- 24 corporation would not be liable.
- 25 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Well, what

- 1 source have you --
- 2 MS. SULLIVAN: The corporation would not be
- 3 liable.
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: What source have you for
- 5 that proposition?
- 6 MS. SULLIVAN: The -- look to Justice Story
- 7 in U.S. v. Smith, cited in the Respondents' brief at
- 8 footnote 12. It looks to piracy. And piracy is
- 9 allowed -- in rem actions. You could seize the ship
- 10 with which the piracy was committed, as you could later
- 11 slave trading ships. But you could not seize another
- 12 ship, and you could not seize the assets of the
- 13 corporation. So, piracy --
- 14 JUSTICE BREYER: You couldn't seize another
- 15 person other than Blackbeard. That's why -- if the ship
- is owned by a corporation, and they sue the corporation
- in 18 -- 17 whatever it was -- '96 or something, what
- 18 reason do we have to think that the corporation would
- 19 have lost -- I mean, would have won?
- MS. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, let's be clear
- 21 that Sosa referred to specific norms. So, the answer to
- 22 Pirates, Inc., does not determine the answer in this
- 23 case, which is about whether corporations can commit
- 24 post-Nuremberg human rights offenses.
- 25 A given norm must be applicable to a

- 1 corporation. So, even if I gave you Pirates, Inc., it
- 2 wouldn't decide this case. But in fact Pirates, Inc.,
- 3 was not suable; it was the ship that could be seized.
- 4 But to answer Your Honor's question about
- 5 the genocide convention, perhaps I could go back. I
- 6 want to be very clear: We're not arguing there needs to
- 7 be an international adjudicated case finding a
- 8 corporation liable in order for Petitioners to win, but
- 9 they have failed to show anything in the conventions,
- 10 the non-binding treaties engaged in by multiple nations.
- 11 They failed to show anything in custom or practice.
- 12 They failed --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: But, Ms. Sullivan, I think
- 14 that that's mostly because all of these are written to
- 15 prohibit certain acts, and they don't talk about the
- 16 actors. So, if I could, you know, draw an analogy, it's
- 17 as if somebody came and said, you know, this -- this
- 18 norm of international law does not apply to Norwegians.
- 19 And you -- well, there's no case about Norwegians. And
- 20 it doesn't specifically say "Norwegians." But, of
- 21 course, it applies to Norwegians because it prevents
- 22 everybody from committing a certain kind of act.
- 23 MS. SULLIVAN: But, Justice Kagan,
- 24 international law does speak to who may be liable, which
- 25 you correctly identified as a substantive question, not

- 1 a question of enforcement. And international law holds
- 2 corporations liable for some international law
- 3 violations. Look to the convention on the suppression
- 4 of the financing of terrorism, which speaks about legal
- 5 entities, or the convention on bribery of public
- 6 officials, which speaks about legal persons.
- 7 But the human rights offenses here do not
- 8 arise from conventions like those which allow corporate
- 9 liability. To the contrary. The human rights offenses
- 10 here arise from conventions that speak to individual
- 11 liability. The liability of individuals.
- 12 And, Justice Breyer, in precise answer to
- 13 your question about the convention on genocide, if you
- 14 look to the Chevron brief on page 20 -- this is the
- 15 amicus brief of Chevron filed by Professor Goldsmith.
- 16 On page 20, it quotes in full the relevant passage from
- 17 the genocide convention, Article IV.
- I'm sorry there are many briefs, but perhaps
- 19 if I could read it to Your Honors, I will read it in
- 20 full.
- It says that "persons committing genocide or
- 22 any of the other acts enumerated in Article III shall be
- 23 punished whether they are constitutionally responsible
- 24 rulers, public officials or private individuals."
- 25 And Justice Kagan, all the other relevant

- 1 conventions also speak about natural persons. The
- 2 convention against torture speaks about him, not it.
- 3 And when Congress, in the one time it implemented the
- 4 conventions that are the source of the human rights
- 5 offenses that are alleged here, Congress in the Torture
- 6 Victim Protection Act said that the suit may be brought
- 7 against individuals. And it expressly declined to use
- 8 the term "persons," which could embrace corporations.
- 9 And we've --
- 10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You're getting ahead
- 11 of yourself. We haven't decided that question just yet.
- 12 (Laughter.)
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: But this statute doesn't
- 14 use the word "individual," and it doesn't use the word
- 15 "person." As far as a corporate entity is concerned, a
- 16 corporate -- a corporation could sue, could be a
- 17 plaintiff under the Alien Tort Statute, could it not?
- 18 There's no --
- 19 MS. SULLIVAN: Justice Ginsburg, a
- 20 corporation could sue if it were an alien, and if you
- 21 decided the alien embraced corporations. And of course,
- 22 the Attorney General Bradford opinion from 1795, which I
- 23 agree with the Chief Justice, extended -- and with
- 24 Justice Alito -- did not extend to conduct in other
- 25 countries; it extended only to conduct on the high seas.

1	But Bradford the Bradford opinion, if you
2	give it any credit, only establishes that a corporation
3	may be a plaintiff. It does not speak to the question
4	here, which is whether a corporation may be a defendant.
5	JUSTICE KAGAN: Miss Sullivan, take an
6	example that has all the extraterritoriality aspects of
7	this case taken away from it. Let's assume that the
8	French ambassador is assaulted or attacked in some way
9	in the United States, and that that attack is by a
10	corporate agent. Would we say that the corporation
11	there cannot be sued under the Alien Tort Statute?
12	MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor. You would
13	say that because there is no assaulting ambassador norm
14	that applies to corporations.
15	I just want to go back and
16	JUSTICE KAGAN: Could you explain to me
17	we would have to sue the person individually?
18	MS. SULLIVAN: Exactly. Exactly.
19	JUSTICE KAGAN: What so this goes back to
20	Justice Breyer's question. Where do you find that in
21	international law? Where where does it say, when the
22	French ambassador is sued in the United States by a
23	corporate agent, we can't sue the corporation?
24	MS. SULLIVAN: The burden rests on the
25	Petitioners to show that the norm is established by

- 1 international law; not on us to show that corporate
- 2 liability is any --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Congress could -- could
- 4 pass a statute to that effect.
- 5 MS. SULLIVAN: Could absolutely. Congress
- 6 tomorrow, Justice Scalia --
- 7 JUSTICE SCALIA: The issue is whether this
- 8 did it or not.
- 9 MS. SULLIVAN: This did not. And what
- 10 international law has not established -- not just
- 11 through cases, Justice Breyer, but through any source,
- 12 convention, or custom -- if you look to the
- 13 jurisdictional statutes of the ICC -- the Rome
- 14 Statute --
- 15 JUSTICE KAGAN: You don't -- of course one
- 16 could bring an ATS suit against the individual. Is that
- 17 right?
- 18 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor.
- 19 JUSTICE KAGAN: Now, all United States law
- 20 and mostly in other countries' law would hold the
- 21 corporation liable for the individual's act. Isn't that
- 22 right? That's a general principle of law.
- 23 MS. SULLIVAN: Justice Kagan, let's be clear
- 24 to separate two very different causes of action. There
- 25 is no country, and to answer Justice Ginsburg's first

- 1 question, there is no country in the world that provides
- 2 a civil cause of action against a corporation under
- 3 their domestic law for a violation of the law of
- 4 nations. In Mr. Hoffman's hypothetical, if there were a
- 5 suit in England or in the Netherlands, it would be for
- 6 assault and battery, wrongful death, or --
- 7 JUSTICE KAGAN: Miss Sullivan that would be
- 8 true against an individual as well. The ATS is just a
- 9 unique statute. It's unique against individuals, and
- 10 it's unique against corporations. That doesn't answer
- 11 the question that you're here to address which is
- 12 whether corporations are meaningfully different from
- 13 individuals.
- 14 MS. SULLIVAN: They are meaningfully
- 15 different from individuals under international law which
- 16 is the crucial choice of law question that you need to
- 17 answer here. The crucial question that is at the
- 18 threshold is which law determines whether corporations
- 19 are liable.
- JUSTICE BREYER: I think you are right on
- 21 that point. What about slavery? Genocide -- I see your
- 22 point in the Goldsmith brief. But what about slavery?
- 23 That seems like contrary to international law norms,
- 24 basic law norms, it could be committed by an individual.
- 25 And why, if it could be committed by an individual,

- 1 could it not also be committed by a corporation in
- 2 violation of an international norm?
- 3 MS. SULLIVAN: Let me be clear. The
- 4 question is not "could."
- 5 JUSTICE BREYER: No, no. I have read the
- 6 reason why, as you point out in your briefs, the
- 7 corporations are different in many countries as if they
- 8 are not moral persons. And I have in my mind filled in
- 9 the blanks on that, and I think I know what it refers
- 10 to. All right. That's the rationale that kept them out
- 11 of some of these treaties.
- 12 And now the question would be, all right,
- 13 are they always kept out no matter what? And I'm
- 14 bringing up the two counterexamples I think were fairly
- 15 strong, was Pirates Inc. But that's a joke example. And
- 16 the other -- although it's a point. And the other is
- 17 slavery. What about, what about that one?
- MS. SULLIVAN: Corporate liability, even for
- 19 norms, on which the international community agrees --
- 20 torture, genocide, piracy, slavery -- corporate
- 21 liability is a substantive norm that is established by
- 22 international law. And the nations of the world, for
- 23 various reasons, have treated individuals and
- 24 corporations differently. And Justice Kennedy, over and
- 25 over and over again, it's not just the Respondent's

- 1 brief at page 17 but the U.K. Netherlands brief, two of
- 2 our most important allies, filed a brief of Respondents,
- 3 saying at pages 11 through 15: There is no
- 4 international norm applicable to corporations for
- 5 violations of the human rights offenses here.
- Now the international community has many
- 7 reasons for this. In 1998 when our own statute
- 8 established the ICC, the signatories actually discussed
- 9 whether to have criminal liability for corporations; and
- 10 as the Scheffer amicus brief in support of Petitioners
- 11 points out at page 18, they actually also discussed
- 12 civil liability for corporations. And the nations of
- 13 the world who created the ICC, one of the most important
- 14 modern instruments for bringing about human rights
- 15 prosecutions, declined to embrace jurisdiction over
- 16 corporations.
- 17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Can you tell me why you
- 18 think they did that? I mean, for us, the respondeat
- 19 superior is so simple. Why is it a big deal in
- 20 international law?
- MS. SULLIVAN: Well, Justice Kennedy,
- 22 there's many reasons. For one, a corporation involves
- 23 many innocent stakeholders beyond the perpetrators. And
- 24 the regime established at Nuremberg, if it established
- 25 nothing else, established that it is individuals who are

- 1 liable for human rights offenses. It pierced to the
- 2 notion of hiding behind a state abstract entity, and
- 3 held individuals, including individual businessmen from
- 4 Alfred Krupp to 28 officials indicted from the I.G.
- 5 Farben firm. But Nuremberg was about individual
- 6 liability.
- 7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What happened to I.G.
- 8 Farben? I thought it was dissolved and its assets
- 9 taken.
- 10 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, Justice Ginsburg. I.G.
- 11 Farben was dissolved by the control counsel law number 9
- 12 in 1945. It was a political act. It preceded any of
- 13 the tribunals, either international or national. It was
- 14 not until later that year that the international
- 15 military tribunal began. It prosecuted no corporations.
- 16 When the allies prosecuted perpetrators of
- 17 the Nazi horrors in later cases, they prosecuted again
- 18 only individual officers, not any corporations.
- 19 There are two amicus briefs on the Nuremberg
- 20 history: one in support of Petitioners, filed by
- 21 Jennifer Green, and one in support of neither party
- 22 filed by Jonathan Massey. Both of them agree on one
- 23 proposition, and that is, that no corporation was
- 24 prosecuted by either the international military tribunal
- in 1945 and 46 nor in any of the subsequent U.S.

- 1 tribunals. In fact, in U.S. v --
- 2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But there's no -- there
- 3 was no civil liability adjudicated in Nuremberg. It was
- 4 about criminal.
- 5 MS. SULLIVAN: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 6 And to answer your question, when I.G. Farben was
- 7 dissolved, it was part of denazification,
- 8 decartelization, and a distraction of the Nazi war
- 9 machine of which I.G. Farben was an integral part. It
- 10 was practically viewed as an enemy state in and of
- 11 itself.
- 12 That is a prece -- so the precedent of
- 13 Nuremberg, like the precedent of the ICTY, the ICTR, the
- 14 ICC, all exclude liability for corporations, even for
- 15 the most heinous offenses of the modern era. They focus
- 16 liability, rather, on corporate officers. And Justice
- 17 Kagan, we don't dispute that corporate officers can be
- 18 held to account for these offenses assuming,
- 19 Justice Alito, that we don't have concerns about
- 20 extraterritoriality even as to individuals.
- 21 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, it that's -- if that
- 22 is true -- let me just take you back to this question of
- 23 separating out direct corporate liability from vicarious
- 24 corporate liability. Because it is clear -- one
- 25 question is, is there a substantive international law

- 1 obligation? But there is another question which would
- 2 not be an international law question, which is, a
- 3 remedial question.
- 4 Remedies are addressed by common law rather
- 5 than -- American common law rather than by international
- 6 law. So why shouldn't we look at the vicarious
- 7 liability question as essentially a question about the
- 8 scope of the appropriate remedy once an international
- 9 law violation has been found?
- 10 MS. SULLIVAN: Justice Kagan, you should
- 11 look at questions of corporate liability. Like
- 12 questions of aiding and abetting liability. Like
- 13 questions of individual private liability as opposed to
- 14 state actor liability. You should look at all of those
- 15 questions as substantive questions answered by
- 16 international law. And that's because footnote 20 of
- 17 Sosa says you look to whether international law extends
- 18 liability to the perpetrator being sued.
- 19 You can't just find an act out there and fan
- 20 out to anyone in the entire world, including consumers
- 21 pumping gas in Ohio, and say there's been an act of
- 22 international law violation. It's a question is proof.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: But the question of who can
- 24 sued is a remedial question.
- MS. SULLIVAN: It is not.

- 1 JUSTICE KAGAN: The question of who has an
- 2 obligation is a substantive question.
- 3 MS. SULLIVAN: Respectfully, Justice Kagan,
- 4 we disagree. The question of who may be sued is
- 5 fundamentally part of the question of whether there has
- 6 been a tort committed in violation of the law of
- 7 nations. It would read the verb "committed" out of the
- 8 statute.
- 9 If you just said find a violation of the law
- 10 of nations anywhere and then apply it to whoever you
- 11 want.
- 12 JUSTICE KAGAN: To give you an example, the
- 13 tort in violation of the law nations has been committed.
- 14 It has been committed by the corporate agent. And the
- 15 question then is, can one hold the corporation
- 16 responsible for that tort. And that seems to be a
- 17 question of enforcement, of remedy; not of substantive
- 18 international law.
- MS. SULLIVAN: Justice Kagan, we
- 20 respectfully disagree. That is a question of
- 21 substantive law. Think about a domestic analogy. Look
- 22 to the restatement of conflicts. You would ask
- 23 whether -- you would not look to foreign law to
- 24 determine a question of respondeat superior or
- 25 contribution or indemnity. You would not look to

- 1 foreign law to determine whether, in the words of the
- 2 restatement, one person is liable for the tort of the
- 3 other.
- 4 You would look to the law of the place of
- 5 misconduct or the place of where the corporation is
- 6 headquartered. Foreign law determines in this case
- 7 whether you had could have civil remedies rather than
- 8 criminal. We concede that the ATS allows a civil remedy
- 9 where the world would impose only criminal liability.
- 10 That's because civil liability versus
- 11 criminal liability, that's a matter of remedy. So would
- 12 be the amount of damages. So would be the choice of
- 13 compensatory or punitive damages. Those are matters of
- 14 remedy for domestic law to decide.
- 15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: If you look to the law of
- 16 the place where the corporation is headquartered, well,
- 17 suppose that has a typical respondeat superior liability
- 18 says corporations are liable for the acts of their
- 19 agents. So -- and most -- correct me if I am wrong, I
- 20 think most countries in the world have such a notion
- 21 that corporate -- corporations are responsible for the
- 22 acts of their agents. So how does that -- looking to
- 23 the law where the corporation is headquartered, where
- 24 does that get you when that country has the very same
- 25 law that we do, that yes, corporations are liable for

- 1 the acts of their agents?
- 2 MS. SULLIVAN: Justice Ginsberg,
- 3 respectfully, we don't think the world is all of one
- 4 when it comes to issues of corporate responsibility for
- 5 the acts of its agents. If you look at the ICJ --
- 6 sorry, if you look at the Rome Statute, the Rome Statute
- 7 itself has very particular sections about when an -- a
- 8 corporate superior is liable for the actions of a
- 9 corporate inferior.
- 10 It looks to a knowledge and deliberate
- 11 indifference standard. Not every nation of the world
- 12 agrees on what standard must -- there must be for even
- 13 attributing the agent's act at the bottom of the
- 14 corporate hierarchy to a senior officer, much less to
- 15 the corporation as an entity.
- In answer to your question about -- earlier
- 17 about respondeat superior, Justice Kagan, the only way a
- 18 corporation can do anything is through the acts of human
- 19 beings; thus there is always the question when it comes
- 20 to corporate liability to ask how to attribute the
- 21 action of the human beings who work for the corporation
- 22 to the corporation. And we respectfully submit that
- 23 Sosa footnote 20 commits that question, as does the ATS
- 24 itself, to international law. Yes?
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, I wonder if you

- 1 don't concede away too much, when you say well, there is
- 2 a difference in substance and -- and remedy and
- 3 questions of jury trial, damages and so forth. That's
- 4 domestic.
- 5 Those were the concerns that the U.K. and
- 6 the Netherlands addressed in their brief as saying why
- 7 corporations shouldn't be liable for acts committed on
- 8 foreign -- foreign territories. That was the whole
- 9 reasoning of -- of -- of the U.K. brief.
- 10 MS. SULLIVAN: Justice Kennedy, I agree
- 11 completely on what may be very clear on one thing. I've
- 12 addressed only step one of Sosa, which is, does
- 13 international law provide for a specific universal and
- 14 obligatory norm of corporate liability. It does not.
- 15 In fact it refutes it. The Rome Statute rejected
- 16 liability for corporations. The jurisdictional statutes
- of the ICTY and the ICTR apply jurisdiction only to
- 18 natural persons. The international community at step
- 19 one has rejected it.
- 20 But Justice Kennedy, it's very important
- 21 that Sosa puts a second screen into your inquiry. You
- 22 must ask if the second step -- even if international law
- 23 had provided any source of corporate liability, which it
- 24 does not, you would still have to ask: Footnote 30 of
- 25 Sosa says it's a higher bar. Should Federal common law,

- 1 should Federal common law now embrace these kinds of
- 2 actions? And the answer is no.
- 3 Even if you found this were a question of
- 4 domestic remedy, we think you cannot -- this is a
- 5 question of substance. But even if this were a question
- 6 of -- domestic remedy, you should not find liability for
- 7 corporations for the same reasons you rejected corporate
- 8 liability in Malesko.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Ms. Sullivan, I'm -- in
- 10 Sosa as I understand it, it's all about what is the
- 11 conduct that falls under this law of nations. It is not
- 12 about who is the actor subject to that law. Sosa is
- 13 dealing with what kinds of conduct come within the Alien
- 14 Tort Statute. It -- it doesn't consider the question of
- 15 what actor; that wasn't before the Court. What was
- 16 before the Court is what kind of activity violates, is
- 17 contrary to the law of nations.
- 18 MS. SULLIVAN: Justice Ginsburg,
- 19 respectfully we disagree, and so do all the courts of
- 20 appeals who have addressed the question of aiding and
- 21 abetting liability. Every court of appeals save one,
- 22 including the Ninth Circuit and the DC Circuit, which
- 23 disagreed with us on the outcome, said that the question
- 24 of whether international law prohibits liability for
- 25 aiding and abetting is to be determined by international

- 1 law. The second --
- JUSTICE BREYER: You could -- you could --
- 3 first, maybe you addressed this case. There was a case
- 4 called Skinner v. East India Company.
- 5 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor. That was
- 6 under English tort law, 1666.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Okay, all right. Now --
- 8 what I'm thinking of, is if you go through the
- 9 rationale, as you find some instances where individuals
- 10 could in fact violate an international law norm, and
- 11 then you find a lack of a reason why a corporation
- 12 couldn't do the same. Now in that kind of category,
- 13 could the Court say we're interpreting Federal common
- 14 law here to determine who can be sued under this
- 15 statute? That's the remedial part.
- MS. SULLIVAN: You may --
- 17 JUSTICE BREYER: And so what we are saying
- 18 is that there is a -- in certain circumstances there
- 19 could be a suit against your corporation. You would
- 20 have to be careful, because you recognize that by
- 21 creating a -- a suit against your corporation you are
- 22 saying every country in the world could do the same.
- 23 And -- and therefore, but maybe there are instances of
- 24 like, universal jurisdiction recognized under
- 25 international law, where you could be pretty certain no

- 1 harm would be done by that.
- 2 And so what I'm thinking of is -- is a way
- 3 of enforcing it.
- 4 MS. SULLIVAN: Justice Breyer, first we
- 5 disagree that the question of who may be sued is a
- 6 question of enforcement. We think that bridge --
- JUSTICE BREYER: No, I --
- 8 MS. SULLIVAN: -- was crossed in Sosa. And
- 9 as I was saying to Justice Ginsburg, in all the cases
- 10 that hold, all the courts of appeals agree that who may
- 11 be liable, just primary actors or also aiders and
- 12 abetters, is determined by international law as a
- 13 question of substance. So we disagree with the premise.
- 14 But to answer Your Honor's question, the Federal common
- 15 law still should not fly in the face of Congress, and I
- 16 think the important question in your hypothetical is who
- is the "you"?
- 18 As Justice Scalia just pointed out, Congress
- 19 could amend the ATS tomorrow to provide for a Federal
- 20 common -- a Federal statutory cause of action against
- 21 corporations. But the one time Congress spoke to the
- 22 very question at issue here, it held the diametric
- 23 opposite. Congress in the TVPA rejected corporate
- 24 liability by choosing the term "individuals" rather than
- 25 "persons." And I realize, Mr. Chief Justice, that is

- 1 the next case, but we think there is really the answer
- 2 that the TVPA excludes corporations is compelled, and
- 3 the U.S. agrees.
- 4 So Your Honor, the question is not what
- 5 should Federal courts do in the abstract, it's what
- 6 should Federal courts do when there is exact statutory
- 7 decisionmaking by the political branches that has gone
- 8 the other way. In maritime law in Miles v. Apex, you
- 9 didn't -- you didn't decide to go contrary to Congress
- in the Jones Act; you said if there is a Jones Act
- 11 statutory statement about wrongful death, we should
- 12 follow it in Federal common law.
- 13 Similarly here, even if the international
- 14 community thought there was anything to corporate
- 15 liability -- which it doesn't, it disagrees; our two
- 16 allies the U.K. and Netherlands disagree, and Germany
- 17 has filed a brief saying it also disagrees with the ATS
- 18 as it has been applied -- even if there was
- 19 international consensus, you would still have to ask
- 20 should the Federal courts, through free-form Federal
- 21 common law making, do the opposite of what Congress is
- 22 saying?
- 23 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, we know the way to do
- 24 it. I mean, in Skinner, even if it was English common
- 25 law, the court reasons -- it says the taking of the ship

- on the high seas was "odious and punishable by all laws
- of God and man." So we -- could you not say, where an
- 3 action is forbidden by the international law, and it is
- 4 punishable or -- by all laws of God and man, in such a
- 5 circumstance there being no reason to deny corporate
- 6 liability here, even under the moral person rule, it --
- 7 we interpret the Federal common law to permit that
- 8 remedy?
- 9 MS. SULLIVAN: Well, Your Honor, the ATS has
- 10 language that says the tort must be committed in
- 11 violation of the law of nations. So although, Justice
- 12 Ginsburg, it doesn't specify who may be the defendants,
- 13 it does point us to the law of nations to figure out
- 14 what the law of nations thinks about who may be the
- 15 defendants, and the law of nations is uniform. It
- 16 rejects corporate liability. It rejects corporate
- 17 liability.
- 18 So to find a Federal common law cause of
- 19 action here is to fly in the face of both the
- 20 international community, with all the foreign policy
- 21 consequences Justice Kennedy referred to earlier, if as
- 22 Mr. -- as the Chief Justice said earlier, the point of
- 23 the ATS was to stop war, by making sure there was a
- 24 forum for the Marbois incident, so that France wouldn't
- 25 think it had to go to war on us to stop the offense ti

- 1 its sovereignty -- but it will it provoke war to out
- 2 ahead of the international, foiling the purpose of the
- 3 ATS.
- 4 But also, and this is --
- 5 JUSTICE KAGAN: Ms. Sullivan, could I take
- 6 you back --
- 7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: I think it has taken that
- 8 into account. You are just representing the
- 9 corporations to say what is in the interests of the
- 10 United States, when the United States representative
- 11 told us they think that individuals and corporations are
- 12 both subject to suit.
- MS. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, respectfully,
- 14 we -- we accept that the United States here before you
- 15 today doesn't speak to the foreign -- foreign policy
- 16 consequences of this kind of ATS liability. And we
- 17 haven't even gotten to the alternative ground,
- 18 Justice Alito and the Chief Justice referred to earlier,
- 19 which is Charming Betsy canon says don't lightly
- 20 construe your law to offend international law. But just
- 21 back to the -- the -- the United States, I respectfully
- 22 suggest you should look to the TVPA, rather than simply
- 23 to what the United States says here today. And the
- 24 TVPA, which is Congress interpreting --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, the TVPA is one

- 1 limited statute dealing with one particular category of
- offense, and it was specifically meant to supplement,
- 3 not to supplant, the ATS. So between those two things,
- 4 the fact that it's limited to torture, and that there
- 5 was no design to supplant the ATS, I quess I think that
- 6 if your best shot is the TVPA, that's a -- that's a weak
- 7 one.
- 8 MS. SULLIVAN: Well, far -- it's -- it's one
- 9 of many sources, Your Honor.
- Just to go back to the key point about
- 11 international community. The international community --
- 12 Justice Breyer says don't just look for adjudicated
- opinions, but every convention for every international
- 14 tribunal excludes corporations.
- 15 Look to the U.N. process. The Petitioners
- 16 make a great deal out of the U.N. process that's taken
- 17 place since 2007. We cite the U.N. special
- 18 representative, saying "I have looked at the
- 19 international human rights instruments that are out
- 20 there, and I find no basis" --
- 21 JUSTICE KAGAN: Miss Sullivan, if I asked
- 22 you --
- 23 MS. SULLIVAN: -- "for corporate liability."
- That's the U.N., not Congress.
- 25 JUSTICE KAGAN: You -- you said the

- 1 international community draws this line. And as far as
- 2 I can see, the international sources are simply silent
- 3 as to this question. So if I said to you, Miss
- 4 Sullivan, I want to go back and read the best thing you
- 5 have saying that the international law sources draw this
- 6 line, what do I read?
- 7 MS. SULLIVAN: Read first of all the Rome
- 8 Statute, 1998, and the legislative history.
- 9 JUSTICE KAGAN: But the Rome Statute is
- 10 different, because the Rome Statute is about criminal
- 11 liability. And we know that the Rome Statute was meant
- 12 to complement many international states' laws which in
- 13 fact do not hold corporations criminally liable
- 14 domestically.
- 15 MS. SULLIVAN: Read -- but the Rome Statute
- 16 also rejected civil liability. That's in the Scheffer
- 17 brief. The Scheffer amicus brief. He was our
- 18 representative there, and he said civil liability was
- 19 considered but rejected.
- 20 So the Rome Statute rejected either
- 21 corporate or criminal liability for corporations under
- 22 the new ICC. The ICC -- the ICTY, the convention
- 23 against torture itself, and --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: I thought they re --
- 25 rejected civil liability for everyone. It wasn't

- 1 limited to corporations.
- MS. SULLIVAN: Well, Justice Ginsburg, we
- 3 don't -- we agree that there's no civil liability for
- 4 human rights offenses. The answer to Justice Alito's
- 5 question at the beginning, is there any other nation in
- 6 the world that provides for civil liability for human
- 7 rights violations, the answer is no, there is no other
- 8 nation in the world.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Yes, but that's for
- 10 individuals as well as for corporations --
- 11 MS. SULLIVAN: That's correct. But for
- 12 human rights violations.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Yes. Is there an Article
- 14 III source of jurisdiction for a lawsuit like this?
- MS. SULLIVAN: None other than the ATS, Your
- 16 Honor. If -- there --
- 17 JUSTICE ALITO: What's the constitutional
- 18 basis for a lawsuit like this, where an alien is suing
- 19 an alien?
- MS. SULLIVAN: The -- well, there's no alien
- 21 diversity jurisdiction. So -- because an alien is suing
- 22 an alien. And there is a good argument you could
- 23 dispose of this case, but not all the other ATS cases,
- 24 by simply holding there's no alien diversity
- 25 jurisdiction here. And the ATS can't have been viewed

- 1 as displacing Congress's intent to limit jurisdiction at
- 2 the time. That would dispose of this case, and other
- 3 cases involving foreign corporations sued by other
- 4 plaintiffs. Cases likes Talisman and Nestle and Rio
- 5 Tinto.
- 6 But we respectfully urge you to reach a
- 7 broader ruling, which is that corporate liability is
- 8 foreclosed both by the uniform practice -- the uniform
- 9 practice, not just adjudications -- of the nations of
- 10 the world --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. You're now beginning
- 12 one additional thing, that the corporate rule that
- 13 you're about to cite shows that many people believe
- there shouldn't be a remedy against a corporation
- 15 because they're not moral persons. Why does it show
- 16 that the corporation couldn't violate the substantive
- 17 rule?
- 18 Please.
- 19 MS. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, we do not urge a
- 20 rule of corporate impunity here. Corporate officers are
- 21 liable for human rights violations and for those they
- 22 direct among their employees. There can also be suits
- 23 under State law or the domestic laws of nations, but
- 24 there may not be ATS Federal common law causes of action
- 25 against corporations.

1	Thank you, Your Honor.
2	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
3	Mr. Hoffman, you have 5 minutes remaining.
4	MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you.
5	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF PAUL HOFFMAN
6	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
7	MR. HOFFMAN: Let me just make a few
8	quick
9	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: For all the reasons
10	Justice Kagan mentioned, that the TVPA is not a limiting
11	source, and can be viewed as a supplemental source. But
12	there does appear to be a little bit of incongruity,
13	that aliens can sue corporations for acts against other
14	aliens, but American citizens under the TVPA might not
15	be able to sue corporations.
16	How do we deal with that under
17	MR. HOFFMAN: There are a number of of
18	differences between the TVPA and and the Alien Tort
19	Statute apart from that. I mean, for example, the Alien
20	Tort Statute applies to a much broader range of
21	international human rights violations. Congress decided
22	to legislate in those areas for the reasons that it
23	decided to do that.
24	The one thing that's clear, as as Justice
25	Kagan said, is that the Torture Victim Protection Act

- 1 was designed to -- to establish the -- or to make even
- 2 stronger the Filartiga precedent, and shielded from
- 3 analyses that challenged its bases, and was -- was not
- 4 intended to restrict the Alien Tort Statute in any way.
- 5 And obviously, the next case will discuss in
- 6 greater detail whether the TVPA applies to corporations
- 7 or not. If -- I don't know.
- 8 If I could just make a couple of additional
- 9 points.
- 10 If -- if it was true that international law
- 11 barred corporate liability, then our friends the United
- 12 Kingdom and Netherlands have violated international law
- 13 by passing legislation that imposes criminal liability
- 14 on corporations for violating genocide crimes against
- 15 humanity, and war crimes.
- 16 And I think that brief makes it pretty clear
- 17 that whatever they're saying, that -- if -- if the Alien
- 18 Tort Statute is a domestic enforcement of international
- 19 law, then their views don't apply.
- 20 And -- and -- and this is a tort statute.
- 21 That's -- there was a meaning to torts. Skinner's case,
- 22 for example, was a tort not only under English common
- 23 law, it was -- it was a tort in violation of the law of
- 24 nations. It was robbery on the sea. The law of nations
- 25 was incorporated in English common law just as it was in

- 1 the founding in our country.
- 2 And under the Peck heyday, it is still a
- 3 part of our land -- the law of our land.
- 4 "Tort" meant to the founders "tort
- 5 remedies." It meant -- it meant that the means of
- 6 enforcement would be done by the common law.
- 7 That's all that was available then, it's all
- 8 that's available now. And -- and international law
- 9 places no restriction on the way domestic jurisdictions
- 10 enforce international law. There is a general principle
- 11 law of corporate civil liability for all of the things
- 12 that we allege in this case.
- In every legal system in the world, one can
- 14 get redressed for this kind of thing. Countries don't
- 15 necessarily call it a violation of the law of nations.
- 16 They didn't fashion the statute the way our founders did
- 17 for the reasons that they did --
- 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm sorry -- in
- 19 every nation in the world, you can get redress for this
- 20 sort of thing. But I thought you told us earlier that
- 21 there was no place where this suit could be brought --
- MR. HOFFMAN: No, no. If --
- 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- in other words, a
- 24 suit by an -- an alien against another alien for conduct
- 25 that takes place overseas.

- 1 MR. HOFFMAN: Well, what I'm suggesting -- I
- 2 don't know whether in every domestic jurisdiction, the
- 3 extraterritoriality issue is taken in this same way.
- 4 What I'm suggesting is that for these kinds
- of acts, you can get redress against the corporation
- 6 within every legal system. Now, not every legal
- 7 system -- I don't know every legal system with respect
- 8 to the extraterritoriality issue.
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, that just gets
- 10 back to your basic submission, which is you define the
- 11 international norm based on the act rather than the
- 12 entire issue that's going to be litigated, which
- includes both remedy and actor.
- MR. HOFFMAN: Well, what -- what we
- 15 would suggest is that international law does not
- 16 distinguish with respect to actor, at least in -- with
- 17 respect to these four norms, if we're going by a
- 18 norm-by-norm basis. These acts -- these norms are
- 19 defined in ways that human beings and corporations can
- 20 violate. Privilege --
- 21 JUSTICE SCALIA: What's your position --
- 22 what's your position on aiding and abetting? Is that --
- 23 is that a matter of our domestic law or -- or would --
- 24 would we track international law on that?
- 25 MR. HOFFMAN: The lower courts have treated

1	it in different ways. I think that most of the courts
2	now have found that aiding and abetting is
3	JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't care about the
4	courts. I care about you. What's your position on
5	aiding and abetting?
6	MR. HOFFMAN: I think that that aiding
7	and abetting could be viewed as a conduct regulating
8	norm, that it actually applies to the things that can be
9	done to violate the norm. And therefore, international
10	law would apply to that.
11	I think my my time is up.
12	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
13	The case is submitted.
14	(Whereupon, at 11:04 a.m., the case in the
15	above-entitled matter was submitted.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	1	 I	 I	
A	39:18,22 40:1,5	29:17,20,21	20:2	argued9:3
Abacha 11:20	40:18 41:7	30:11 42:13	analogue 7:4	argues 23:20
abetted 11:19	52:13 55:5,18	50:18,19,20,21	analogy 27:16	arguing 27:6
abetters 44:12	add 14:12	50:22,24 52:18	38:21	argument 1:14
abetting 37:12	additional 51:12	52:19 53:4,17	analyses 53:3	2:2,5,9,12 3:3,7
42:21,25 55:22	53:8	54:24,24	analysis 19:3	4:10 15:9 21:15
56:2,5,7	address 7:12	aliens 52:13,14	answer 6:19 7:16	24:23 50:22
able 11:13 12:17	32:11	Alito 7:7,15,19	7:18 14:10 15:3	52:5
52:15	addressed7:3	7:24 10:9,13,17	22:25 23:19	Article 28:17,22
above-entitled	20:1 37:4 41:6	11:16,25 12:15	25:2,8 26:21,22	50:13
1:13 56:15	41:12 42:20	29:24 36:19	27:4 28:12	asked 6:12 15:1
abroad 6:15	43:3	47:18 50:13,17	31:25 32:10,17	25:3 48:21
absolutely 31:5	adjudicate 8:12	Alito's 50:4	36:6 40:16 42:2	aspect 20:8
abstract 35:2	adjudicated 27:7	allege 54:12	44:14 45:1 50:4	aspects 30:6
45:5	36:3 48:12	alleged 3:22 4:1	50:7	assault 9:23 32:6
abuses 4:1	adjudications	11:19 21:9 25:7	answered 37:15	assaulted 30:8
accept 47:14	51:9	29:5	answer's 23:14	assaulting 30:13
accept 47.14 accepted 13:13	adopted 21:4	allies 34:2 35:16	apart 52:19	assaults 9:13
account 36:18	agent 30:10,23	45:16	Apex 45:8	assets 26:12
47:8	38:14	allow 16:7 18:3	appeals 15:14	35:8
act 13:14 17:16	agents 16:4 22:9	28:8	42:20,21 44:10	assume 13:21
17:24 18:2,6,8	39:19,22 40:1,5	allowed 26:9	appear 52:12	30:7
27:22 29:6	agent's 40:13	allowing 8:17	APPEARANC	assuming 16:7
31:21 35:12	agree 13:20	allows 39:8	1:16	36:18
37:19,21 40:13	29:23 35:22	alternative 47:17	applicable 26:25	assumption
45:10,10 52:25	41:10 44:10	ambassador 9:17	34:4	15:22
55:11	50:3	13:1 30:8,13,22	application 22:22	ATS 16:7 24:10
action 8:5 13:13	agrees 4:24 10:1	ambassadors	applied 13:7 19:2	31:16 32:8 39:8
16:8,11,16	33:19 40:12	9:13	19:5 45:18	40:23 44:19
24:14 31:24	45:3	ambassador's	applies 25:13	45:17 46:9,23
32:2 40:21	ahead 15:2 29:10	22:10	27:21 30:14	47:3,16 48:3,5
44:20 46:3,19	47:2	amend 44:19	52:20 53:6 56:8	50:15,23,25
51:24	aided 11:19	Amerada 17:25	apply 5:2,20	51:24
actions 4:18 26:9	aiders 44:11	18:11	13:18 14:15	ATS's 24:15
40:8 42:2	aiding 37:12	American 8:16	19:3 25:15	attack 10:21
activity 42:16	42:20,25 55:22	22:13 37:5	27:18 38:10	11:2 30:9
actor 18:25,25	56:2,5,6	52:14	41:17 53:19	attacked 10:7
19:21 20:8	AL 1:5,8	amici 11:9	56:10	12:22,25 30:8
23:13,17,18	Alfred 35:4	amicus 1:21 2:7	applying 24:11	Attorney 9:20
37:14 42:12,15	alien 3:14 6:19	3:23 6:23,24	appropriate	10:25 22:5
55:13,16	7:4 8:23 9:22	15:10 28:15	14:14 37:8	29:22
actors 20:3 27:16	10:6 12:2,7,8	34:10 35:19	arbitrary 4:16	attribute 40:20
44:11	14:15,18 15:16	49:17	area 5:7	attributing 40:13
acts 4:23 16:4	18:16,17 20:12	amount 39:12	areas 52:22	authority 4:4
27:15 28:22	21:3 22:5,8	analogous 5:8	argue 9:2	available 54:7,8
-1.12 -0.44	<i>)</i> -	ı	. –	,-

aware 9:6	bottom 40:13	businessmen	43:18,25	36:24 41:11
a.m 1:15 3:2	Bradford 9:19,20	35:3	certainly 12:9	52:24 53:16
56:14	9:23 10:4,12,15		chain 16:18	clearly 5:21 8:12
	10:25 29:22	C	challenged 53:3	17:3 24:18
B	30:1,1	C 2:1 3:1	Chandler 21:5	colony 9:24
back 10:23 14:9	branches 45:7	California 1:17	Charming 47:19	come 42:13
27:5 30:15,19	Breyer 14:9,24	call 54:15	Chevron 3:24	comes 5:19 7:13
36:22 47:6,21	22:24 23:22	called 43:4	28:14,15	40:4,19
48:10 49:4	24:3 25:4,9,12	canon 47:19	Chief 3:3,9 6:9	command 16:18
55:10	25:23,25 26:4	care 56:3,4	8:14 9:12 15:6	commit 26:23
balance 15:5	26:14 28:12	careful 43:20	15:12 20:25	commitment
bar 41:25	31:11 32:20	case 3:4,20 4:15	21:7,21,24	12:10,12
BARINEM 1:5	33:5 43:2,7,17	6:3 8:2,7,11	24:20,25 29:10	commits 22:13
barred53:11	44:4,7 45:23	11:7,8,17,18	29:23 44:25	40:23
based 24:10	48:12 51:11	11:22,22 13:22	46:22 47:18	committed 11:20
55:11	Breyer's 30:20	14:2,16,16,17	52:2 54:18,23	18:1 26:10
bases 53:3	bribery 28:5	17:2,25 18:7,15	55:9 56:12	32:24,25 33:1
basic 32:24	bridge 44:6	23:7,11,12	choice 32:16	38:6,7,13,14
55:10	brief 3:21,23	25:10,11,14	39:12	41:7 46:10
basis 4:15 48:20	6:24,24 11:17	26:23 27:2,7,19	choosing 44:24	committing
50:18 55:18	16:24 19:9	30:7 39:6 43:3	Circuit 10:18	27:22 28:21
battery 32:6	22:25 26:7	43:3 45:1 50:23	13:22 16:5	common 14:16
bear 20:11	28:14,15 32:22	51:2 53:5,21	42:22,22	16:8 19:11 23:4
began 6:9 35:15	34:1,1,2,10	54:12 56:13,14	circumstance	23:5 24:13,14
beginning 50:5	41:6,9 45:17	cases 7:1,22	46:5	37:4,5 41:25
51:11	49:17,17 53:16	13:18 16:7	circumstances	42:1 43:13
behalf 1:4,17,23	briefed9:3	31:11 35:17	16:11 43:18	44:14,20 45:12
2:4,11,14 3:8	briefing 11:7	44:9 50:23 51:3	cite 48:17 51:13	45:21,24 46:7
24:24 52:6	briefs 4:3 8:20	51:4	cited 26:7	46:18 51:24
beings 40:19,21	15:22 28:18	categorical	citizens 22:14	53:22,25 54:6
55:19	33:6 35:19	15:15 23:23	52:14	community 12:13
believe 7:17 8:4	bring 14:17	categorically	citizenship 7:25	33:19 34:6
8:8 51:13	31:16	8:22 14:7	civil 3:25 5:5	41:18 45:14
believed 9:10	bringing 33:14	category 16:7	6:13 10:5 32:2	46:20 48:11,11
best 4:4 48:6	34:14	18:7 43:12 48:1	34:12 36:3 39:7	49:1
49:4	British 9:24	cause 16:8 24:14	39:8,10 49:16	company 22:6,9
Betsy 47:19	10:25	32:2 44:20	49:18,25 50:3,6	43:4
beyond 20:10	broader 51:7	46:18	54:11	compelled 45:2
34:23	52:20	causes 31:24	claim 3:18	compensatory
big 34:19	brought 7:11,21	51:24	claims 7:11 8:13	39:13
binding 13:21	8:2,15 14:1	centers 3:16	13:14	complement
bit 52:12	25:16 29:6	century 25:16	clarification	49:12
Blackbeard	54:21	certain 5:12	14:25	completely 41:11
25:18 26:15	burden30:24	17:12 18:2 23:7	clear 9:9 26:20	complicated
blanks 33:9	business 11:22	23:13 27:15,22	27:6 31:23 33:3	23:23 24:12
		I	=::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::	

				5
concede 39:8	contravenes	30:2,4,10,23	39:24 43:22	15:10
41:1	8:18	31:21 32:2 33:1	54:1	custom 27:11
concern 8:17	contribution	34:22 35:23	country's 12:12	31:12
concerned 29:15	38:25	38:15 39:5,16	couple 4:8 53:8	customary 6:14
concerns 36:19	control 16:13	39:23 40:15,18	course 4:10	25:5
41:5	35:11	40:21,22 43:11	27:21 29:21	
concluded 22:6	controversy	43:19,21 51:14	31:15	D
conduct 6:15	10:21	51:16 55:5	court 1:1,14 3:10	D 3:1
16:8 17:12,23	conveniens	corporations	3:11,25 5:17,20	damages 39:12
20:8,9,16 21:9	14:13	3:15 5:10,15,20	8:24 9:18,21	39:13 41:3
21:13 22:1	convention 9:18	5:23 6:14 8:22	10:23,23 11:1,6	DC 42:22
29:24,25 42:11	27:5 28:3,5,13	14:2,7 19:6	11:13 12:17	deal 10:2 14:13
42:13 54:24	28:17 29:2	20:6 21:4,6	13:19 14:18	34:19 48:16
56:7	31:12 48:13	25:6 26:23 28:2	15:13,14 17:25	52:16
conducting 22:1	49:22	29:8,21 30:14	18:11 23:2	dealing 42:13
conflate 4:25	conventions 27:9	32:10,12,18	24:16 25:1	48:1
conflicts 38:22	28:8,10 29:1,4	33:7,24 34:4,9	42:15,16,21	deals 18:6
Congress 9:7	corporate 3:22	34:12,16 35:15	43:13 45:25	death 32:6 45:11
12:16 29:3,5	11:11 13:16	35:18 36:14	courts 6:5 7:1,5	decartelization
31:3,5 44:15,18	15:21,24 17:8	39:18,21,25	8:12 11:23	36:8
44:21,23 45:9	19:4 20:19 28:8	41:7,16 42:7	12:18 42:19	decide 23:5
45:21 47:24	29:15,16 30:10	44:21 45:2 47:9	44:10 45:5,6,20	24:13 27:2
48:24 52:21	30:23 31:1	47:11 48:14	55:25 56:1,4	39:14 45:9
Congress's 51:1	33:18,20 36:16	49:13,21 50:1	Court's 21:5	decided 8:24
connection 4:2	36:17,23,24	50:10 51:3,25	coverage 8:23	29:11,21 52:21
7:8 11:25	37:11 38:14	52:13,15 53:6	covered 17:19	52:23
consensus 5:4	39:21 40:4,8,9	53:14 55:19	created 34:13	decision 16:6
12:3 45:19	40:14,20 41:14	correct 21:19	creates 12:6	21:5
consequences	41:23 42:7	36:5 39:19	creating 43:21	decisionmaking
22:17,18 46:21	44:23 45:14	50:11	credit 30:2	45:7
47:16	46:5,16,16	correctly 27:25	crimes 4:16 5:18	declined 29:7
consider 42:14	48:23 49:21	counsel 3:19	5:19 53:14,15	34:15
consideration	51:7,12,20,20	35:11 52:2	criminal 5:6,8,13	defendant 6:16
19:17	53:11 54:11	56:12	5:16,19,24 10:5	18:18,19 19:21
considered 49:19	corporation 3:12	counterexampl	16:15 22:11	20:18 23:6,6
constitutional	4:20 5:2 10:7	23:25 33:14	23:14 34:9 36:4	30:4
9:18 50:17	15:15 16:3,11	counterpart 6:13	39:8,9,11 49:10	defendants 7:25
constitutionally	16:14,17 17:5	countries 5:23	49:21 53:13	12:18 13:16,16
28:23	19:22 20:23	8:4 14:3 29:25	criminally 5:16	46:12,15
construe 47:20	22:13,15,23	31:20 33:7	49:13	define 55:10
consumers 37:20	23:6,16,18,24	39:20 54:14	criteria 19:18	defined 4:18,19
contacts 14:4	24:9,17 25:19	country 7:10,24	critically 21:8	55:19
contrary 20:24	25:20,24 26:2	7:25 8:15 12:25	crossed 44:8	definition 22:4
21:3 28:9 32:23	26:13,16,16,18	16:9 22:16 23:7	crucial 32:16,17	degree 16:2
42:17 45:9	27:1,8 29:16,20	31:25 32:1	curiae 1:21 2:7	deliberate 40:10
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

36:7 deny 46:5	disempowered 9:8	EDWIN 1:19 2:6 15:9	established	extraterritoria
deny 46:5		17.9	30:25 31:10	7:14 9:1 11:5
•	displacing 51:1	effect 31:4	33:21 34:8,24	13:18 30:6
	dispose 50:23	either 35:13,24	34:24,25	36:20 55:3,8
Deputy 1:19	51:2	49:20	establishes 30:2	
- v	dispute 36:17	eliminate 18:9	ESTHER 1:3	F
	dissolved 35:8	embrace 29:8	ET 1:5,8	Fabrigas 8:10,10
designed 53:1	35:11 36:7	34:15 42:1	event 21:16	face 44:15 46:19
despite 17:17,17	distinct 22:22	embraced 29:21	events 7:8,21	fact 5:15 24:10
detail 53:6	distinction 5:9,11	employed 6:16	everybody 10:1	27:2 36:1 41:15
detain 3:17	17:19	employees 51:22	27:22	43:10 48:4
detention 4:17	distinguish55:16	enacted 12:2	exact 7:4 45:6	49:13
determine 26:22	distraction 36:8	24:19	Exactly 30:18,18	fact-dependent
38:24 39:1	diversity 50:21	endorsed 13:19	example 5:17,22	23:2
43:14	50:24	enemy 36:10	12:21 23:15	failed 27:9,11,12
	doctrine 14:12	enforce 6:6	30:6 33:15	fairly 33:14
	doctrines 14:6	54:10	38:12 52:19	falls 42:11
determines	14:15 15:25	enforced 5:5	53:22	fan 37:19
	documents 10:24	enforcement	examples 22:7	far 5:14 29:15
	doing 24:5	17:1,6,7,12	exclude 36:14	48:8 49:1
_	domestic 5:5,24	19:10,13 20:11	excluded 8:23	Farben 35:5,8,11 36:6,9
11:21	6:5,5,6 7:1,1,5	28:1 38:17 44:6	17:17	50:0,9 fashion 54:16
difference 15:20	7:5 8:16 20:22	53:18 54:6	excludes 45:2	fashioning 24:13
15:25 16:1 41:2	21:17 22:2	enforcing 6:20	48:14	February 1:11
differences	24:16,17 32:3	44:3	exclusion 14:7	federal 14:19
52:18	38:21 39:14	engaged 27:10	Excuse 16:22	19:11 23:5,5
different 9:1 20:1	41:4 42:4,6 51:23 53:18	engines 6:6	executions 4:17	24:13 41:25
25:10,12 31:24 32:12,15 33:7	54:9 55:2,23	England 32:5	exercise 3:25 explain 15:20	42:1 43:13
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	domestically	English 43:6 45:24 53:22,25	30:16	44:14,19,20
differently 33:24	49:14	43.24 33.22,23 entire 37:20	expressed 9:20	45:5,6,12,20
	DR 1:5	55:12	11:11	45:20 46:7,18
	draw27:16 49:5	entirely 19:10	expression 12:10	51:24
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	draws 49:1	entities 21:18	expressly 29:7	figure 46:13
	Dutch 1:8 3:5	28:5	extend 4:23	Filartiga 13:12
directs 24:15	9:17	entity 4:20 29:15	29:24	13:13,21 53:2
	D.C 1:10,20	35:2 40:15	extended 29:23	filed 8:7 11:18
42:19 44:5,13	10:18	enumerated	29:25	28:15 34:2
45:16		28:22	extends 19:19	35:20,22 45:17
disagreed 42:23	E	era 13:7 36:15	20:5 37:17	filled33:8
disagrees 45:15	E 2:1 3:1,1	erred 15:14	extrajudicial	financing 28:4
	earlier40:16	ESQ 1:17,19,22	4:17	find 4:4 11:1 15:2
discuss 53:5	46:21,22 47:18	2:3,6,10,13	extraterritorial	17:14 21:16
discussed 7:22	54:20	essentially 37:7	4:1 9:11,25	23:1,10,20
34:8,11	East 43:4	establish 53:1	22:22	30:20 37:19
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				6
38:9 42:6 43:9	12:24 13:4 30:8	27:5 30:15 43:8	hiding 35:2	22:14 25:6
43:11 46:18	30:22	45:9 46:25	hierarchy 40:14	26:24 28:7,9
48:20	friends 53:11	48:10 49:4	high 10:21 16:17	29:4 34:5,14
finding 27:7	full 11:6,7 28:16	God 46:2,4	29:25 46:1	35:1 40:18,21
finished 14:10	28:20	goes 20:8,16,17	higher 41:25	48:19 50:4,6,12
firm 35:5	fundamental	22:3 30:19	highly 23:1	51:21 52:21
first 3:4 11:16	3:13	going 4:5 14:12	historians 11:10	55:19
12:8,16 14:25	fundamentally	15:3 21:2 24:4	history 35:20	humanity 4:16
19:15 25:3	38:5	55:12,17	49:8	5:18 53:15
31:25 43:3 44:4	further 15:4	gold 25:17	Hoffman 1:17	HUSBAND 1:4
49:7	22:13	Goldsmith 28:15	2:3,13 3:6,7,9	hypothetical
Flomo 16:5	22.13	32:22	4:7,11,13 5:11	32:4 44:16
fly 44:15 46:19	G	good 24:5 50:22	6:8,11,18 7:12	32.4 44.10
focus 36:15	G 3:1	Good-bye 25:20	7:17,20 8:1,19	I
foiling 47:2	gas 37:21	gotten 47:17	9:15 10:12,14	ICC 31:13 34:8
follow45:12	gather 9:13		10:19 11:24	34:13 36:14
footnote 18:24	general 1:19	government 11:1 12:24 13:4		49:22,22
	7:13 9:20 10:25	22:19	12:7,19 13:10	ICJ 40:5
19:16,16,23	22:6 29:22		13:17 14:5,11	ICTR 36:13
26:8 37:16	31:22 54:10	Governmental	15:4,7 17:11	41:17
40:23 41:24	generally 14:5	21:12	52:3,4,5,7,17	ICTY 36:13
forbidden46:3	genocide 5:18	great 48:16	54:22 55:1,14	41:17 49:22
foreclosed 51:8	23:15,19 27:5	greater 53:6	55:25 56:6	identified 27:25
foreign 17:16,24	28:13,17,21	Green 35:21	Hoffman's 32:4	identifies 18:16
18:1,2,6,8,20	32:21 33:20	ground 47:17	hold 17:5,15	identify 18:18
18:22 20:24	53:14	group 21:10	18:12 31:20	III 28:22 50:14
38:23 39:1,6		guess 19:2,12	38:15 44:10	illegal 22:1
41:8,8 46:20	Germany 45:16	48:5	49:13	Immunities
47:15,15 51:3	getting 23:3 29:10	<u> </u>	holding 50:24	
former 17:10		-	holds 25:6 28:1	17:24 18:2,6,8
forth 41:3	Ginsberg 40:2	happened 35:7	Holland 7:21	immunity 18:20
forum 14:12,14	Ginsburg 6:8,11	harm 44:1	home 5:23 25:21	20:16,18
14:19 46:24	13:9,11 29:13	harmed 6:16	Honor 26:20	implemented
forward 18:21	29:19 35:7,10	haven 13:8	30:12 31:18	29:3
found 5:15 8:7	36:2 39:15 42:9	headquartered	36:5 43:5 45:4	implementing
9:21 37:9 42:3	42:18 44:9	39:6,16,23	46:9 47:13 48:9	5:24
56:2	46:12 47:7	hear 3:3 24:5	50:16 51:19	important 6:2,3
founders 6:4,21	49:24 50:2	heinous 36:15	52:1	9:22 11:15
9:10 14:21 54:4	Ginsburg's 31:25	held 3:12 15:15	Honors 28:19	13:21 18:12,15
54:16	give 30:2 38:12	16:12 17:22,25	Honor's 27:4	20:11 34:2,13
founding 9:8,9	given 19:20	21:4,6 22:23	44:14	41:20 44:16
54:1	26:25	24:9,17 35:3	horrors 35:17	impose 39:9
four 55:17	giving 13:5,8	36:18 44:22	house 22:10	imposes 5:24
France 46:24	go 8:21 14:9 15:1	Hess 17:25	human 3:13 4:1	6:13 53:13
free-form 45:20	18:21 20:20	18:12	4:14,18,19 6:23	impossibly 23:1
French 12:16,17	22:12,12 25:21	heyday 54:2	6:24 11:19	impunity 51:20
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				

	1	1	1	1
incident 9:16,16	integral 36:9	involving 51:3	21:21,24 22:12	KATHLEEN
9:19,19 12:14	intended 10:2	irrelevant 4:6	22:24 23:22	1:22 2:10 24:23
12:21 46:24	14:21 53:4	irrigation 22:6	24:3,20,25 25:3	Kavanaugh
incidents 12:14	intent 51:1	issue 3:11,12	25:3,4,9,12,23	10:18
includes 55:13	interested 11:12	8:19,24 9:2,3	25:25 26:4,6,14	Kennedy 3:19
including 35:3	interests 47:9	11:6 15:24 31:7	27:13,23 28:12	4:9 5:7 6:12
37:20 42:22	international	44:22 55:3,8,12	28:25 29:10,13	13:20 14:25
incongruity	3:21 4:14,22	issues 7:3,6	29:19,23,24	22:12 25:3
52:12	5:1,2,3,8,13,16	13:18 14:5,14	30:5,16,19,20	33:24 34:17,21
incorporated	5:19 6:4,7,15	40:4	31:3,6,7,11,15	40:25 41:10,20
24:1 25:15,17	6:23,24 8:18	IV 28:17	31:19,23,25	46:21
53:25	9:5 12:4,6,10	I.G 35:4,7,10	32:7,20 33:5,24	Kennedy's 25:3
indemnity 38:25	12:12 17:4,11	36:6,9	34:17,21 35:7	kept 33:10,13
independent	19:19 20:5,22		35:10 36:2,16	key 48:10
20:22	21:8,10,12	<u>J</u>	36:19,21 37:10	kill 3:17
India 43:4	22:17,18 25:5	Jennifer 35:21	37:23 38:1,3,12	kind 4:20 9:1
indicted 35:4	27:7,18,24 28:1	jointly 3:15	38:19 39:15	12:5 23:7 27:22
indifference	28:2 30:21 31:1	joke 33:15	40:2,17,25	42:16 43:12
40:11	31:10 32:15,23	Jonathan 35:22	41:10,20 42:9	47:16 54:14
individual 13:15	33:2,19,22 34:4	Jones 45:10,10	42:18 43:2,7,17	kinds 4:23 7:3,6
13:24 17:3	34:6,20 35:13	Judge 10:18 16:5	44:4,7,9,18,25	8:13 9:8 42:1
19:22 21:10	35:14,24 36:25	judges 10:9	45:23 46:11,21	42:13 55:4
28:10 29:14	37:2,5,8,16,17	jurisdiction 3:25	46:22 47:5,7,18	Kingdom 5:22
31:16 32:8,24	37:22 38:18	5:6,6,12 8:12	47:18,25 48:12	7:21 53:12
32:25 35:3,5,18	40:24 41:13,18	10:5,6 14:13	48:21,25 49:9	Kiobel 1:3,5 3:4
37:13	41:22 42:24,25	34:15 41:17	49:24 50:2,4,9	Kneedler 1:19
individually 1:3	43:10,25 44:12	43:24 50:14,21	50:13,17 51:11	2:6 15:8,9,12
30:17	45:13,19 46:3	50:25 51:1 55:2	52:2,9,10,24	15:19 16:1,19
individuals 5:10	46:20 47:2,20	jurisdictional	54:18,23 55:9	16:21,23 17:9
28:11,24 29:7	48:11,11,13,19	31:13 41:16	55:21 56:3,12	17:21 18:11,14
32:9,13,15	49:1,2,5,12	jurisdictions 54:9		18:23 19:15,25
33:23 34:25	52:21 53:10,12	jury 41:3	<u>K</u>	20:7,17,21 21:2
35:3 36:20 43:9	53:18 54:8,10	Justice 1:20 3:3	Kagan 13:10	21:19,23 22:3
44:24 47:11	55:11,15,24	3:9,19 4:9 5:7	16:19,22,24	22:21 24:2,7,21
50:10	56:9	6:8,9,11,12 7:7	18:4,23 19:23	know8:1,2 10:20
individual's	interpret 10:18	7:15,19,24 8:14	20:1 27:13,23	10:22 23:11,19
31:21	23:4 46:7	9:12 10:9,13,17	28:25 30:5,16	24:3 27:16,17
inferior 40:9	interpreted	11:16,25 12:15	30:19 31:15,19	33:9 45:23
innocent 34:23	10:10,10 18:9	13:9,10,11,20	31:23 32:7	49:11 53:7 55:2
inquire 17:18	interpreting 9:22	14:9,24,25 15:6	36:17,21 37:10	55:7
inquiry 41:21	43:13 47:24	15:12,19 16:19	37:23 38:1,3,12	knowledge 40:10
instances 43:9	involvement	16:22,24 17:14	38:19 40:17	Krupp 35:4
43:23	15:18	18:4,5,13,23	47:5,25 48:21	
instruments	involves 4:9	19:23 20:1,14 20:19,25 21:7	48:25 49:9 50:9 52:10,25	lack 43:11
34:14 48:19	34:22	20.19,23 21:7	32.10,23	1ack 45.11
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

land 54:3,3	54:3,6,8,10,11	25:6,24 26:3	Malesko 42:8	
language 17:17	54:15 55:15,23	27:8,24 28:2	man 46:2,4	N 2:1,1 3:1
46:10	55:24 56:10	31:21 32:19	Mansfield 8:11	narrow3:12 18:7
large 3:20	laws 46:1,4 49:12	35:1 39:2,18,25	Marbois 9:16	nation 3:24 4:2
largely 11:9	51:23	40:8 41:7 44:11	12:14,21,22	6:13 17:13
LATE 1:4	lawsuit 12:5	49:13 51:21	46:24	40:11 50:5,8
Laughter 4:12	50:14,18	lightly 47:19	maritime 45:8	54:19
23:21 25:22	left 17:12	likes 51:4	maritime-relat	national 35:13
29:12	legal 28:4,6	limit 51:1	10:2	nations 6:21,22
law3:21 4:22 5:1	54:13 55:6,6,7	limitations 18:3	married6:22	10:3 12:13,20
5:2,8 6:4,7,15	legislate 52:22	18:19	Massey 35:22	13:1,6 14:20
6:21,22,22 8:16	legislation 5:24	limited 10:5 16:9	matter 1:13 16:2	27:10 32:4
8:18 9:5 10:3	6:6 7:2,5 53:13	16:10 48:1,4	25:10,13 33:13	33:22 34:12
12:11,12,20	legislative 49:8	50:1	39:11 55:23	38:7,10,13
13:1,6 14:16,20	legitimate 8:17	limiting 52:10	56:15	42:11,17 46:11
16:8,15,16 17:4	Leone 9:24 10:8	line 49:1,6	matters 39:13	46:13,14,15
17:11 18:20	11:3	litigated 55:12	mean 9:2 10:15	51:9,23 53:24
19:11,19 20:5	let's 26:20 30:7	little 52:12	16:2 24:3,4	53:24 54:15
20:22,23 21:6,8	31:23	living 12:25	26:19 34:18	Nation's 12:10
21:17 23:3,4,5	liability 6:14	locus 15:17	45:24 52:19	natural 29:1
23:14 24:13,14	11:11 15:21,21	Longchamps	meaning 19:17	41:18
24:15,16,18	15:23,24 16:3	12:22,23	53:21	nature 15:17
25:5 27:18,24	17:2,8 18:9	look 12:14 16:25	meaningfully	16:6
28:1,2 30:21	19:4,19 28:9,11	22:18 26:6 28:3	32:12,14	navy 21:11
31:1,10,19,20	28:11 31:2	28:14 31:12	means 5:17 54:5	Nazi 35:17 36:8
31:22 32:3,3,15	33:18,21 34:9	37:6,11,14,17	meant 48:2 49:11	necessarily
32:16,18,23,24	34:12 35:6 36:3	38:21,23,25	54:4,5,5	54:15
33:22 34:20	36:14,16,23,24	39:4,15 40:5,6	member 12:13	need 9:6 21:16
35:11 36:25	37:7,11,12,13	47:22 48:12,15	mentioned 52:10	32:16
37:2,4,5,6,9,16	37:14,18 39:9	looked 9:19	Miles 45:8	needs 27:6
37:17,22 38:6,9	39:10,11,17	48:18	military 3:16	neither 35:21
38:13,18,21,23	40:20 41:14,16	looking 19:15	35:15,24	Nestle 51:4
39:1,4,6,14,15	41:23 42:6,8,21	39:22	mind 20:11 33:8	Netherlands
39:23,25 40:24	42:24 44:24	looks 26:8 40:10	minutes 52:3	5:22 32:5 34:1
41:13,22,25	45:15 46:6,16	Lord 8:11	misconduct 39:5	41:6 45:16
42:1,11,12,17	46:17 47:16	lost 26:19	modern 5:12	53:12
42:24 43:1,6,10	48:23 49:11,16	lot 13:17	13:7 34:14	never 15:15
43:14,25 44:12	49:18,21,25	lower55:25	36:15	23:24
44:15 45:8,12	50:3,6 51:7		moral 33:8 46:6	new1:22,22 9:17
45:21,25 46:3,7	53:11,13 54:11	M	51:15	12:12 13:25
46:11,13,14,15	liable 3:13 5:16	M 1:22 2:10	morning 3:4	14:1 49:22
46:18 47:20,20	13:16 15:16	24:23	Mostyn 8:9,10	Nigeria 3:16
49:5 51:23,24	16:4,12,14 17:5	machine 36:9	motivated 9:13	7:22 11:21
53:10,12,19,23	17:16,22 21:4,6	making 45:21	9:15	Nigerian 11:18
53:23,24,25	22:23 24:9,17	46:23	multiple 27:10	Ninth 42:22
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				6
non 14:12	35:1 36:15,18	part 3:20 12:8	3:5	precise 8:1 28:12
non-binding	50:4	20:3,16 36:7,9	pierced35:1	precisely 20:20
27:10	officer 40:14	38:5 43:15 54:3	piracy 9:25 10:2	premise 44:13
non-state 20:3	officers 35:18	particular 7:7	21:11,16 26:8,8	presence 14:3
norm 15:17 17:4	36:16,17 51:20	19:18 21:18	26:10,13 33:20	presented 8:25
19:2,5,18,20	officials 28:6,24	40:7 48:1	Pirates 23:25	presumably
20:9 22:4 26:25	35:4	particularly 5:5	25:15,17 26:22	16:15
27:18 30:13,25	Ogoni 3:18	17:10	27:1,2 33:15	pretty 43:25
33:2,21 34:4	oh 25:18,20	parts 6:19	place 11:2 13:23	53:16
41:14 43:10	Ohio 37:21	party 35:21	39:4,5,16 48:17	prevent 12:3,4
55:11 56:8,9	Okay 23:14 43:7	party 33.21 pass 31:4	54:21,25	prevents 27:21
normally 16:3	51:11	passage 28:16	places 54:9	primarily 12:11
norms 3:13 4:14	once 37:8	passage 26.16 passed 5:23 12:9	plaintiff 18:16,17	primary 12.11 primary 6:6
4:18 5:2,4,17	operated 3:15	passing 53:13	29:17 30:3	44:11
5:18,25 17:11	operations 3:18	PAUL 1:17 2:3	plaintiffs 4:15	principal 3:11
21:10,12 26:21	opinion 9:20,21	2:13 3:7 52:5	7:10 8:6 11:18	principle 8:3,4
32:23,24 33:19	9:23 10:4,10,12	Peck 54:2	14:17 51:4	9:5 13:3,7
55:17,18	10:16 29:22	penalties 5:25	please 3:10	25:13,14 31:22
norm-by-norm	30:1	penalties 3.23 people 51:13	15:13 25:1	54:10
55:18	opinions 11:11	people 51.15 permissible	51:18	principles 6:3
Norwegians	48:13	15:23	point 18:14 20:15	16:10
27:18,19,20,21	opponents 3:17	permit 46:7	32:21,22 33:6	private 19:21
notion 35:2 39:20	opposed 5:6 19:8	permits 3:24	33:16 46:13,22	21:10,13 23:12
number 8:20	37:13	permis 5.24 perpetrator 4:19	48:10	23:17,18 28:24
35:11 52:17	opposite 44:23	19:20 37:18	pointed 44:18	37:13
Nuremberg	45:21	perpetrators	points 23:4 34:11	Privilege 55:20
34:24 35:5,19	oral 1:13 2:2,5,9	34:23 35:16	53:9	process 22:8,10
36:3,13	3:7 15:9 24:23	person 5:3 6:16	policy 16:21	48:15,16
	order 27:8	17:3 26:15	46:20 47:15	Professor 28:15
0	organizations	29:15 30:17	political 35:12	prohibit 27:15
O 2:1 3:1	6:25	39:2 46:6	45:7	prohibition 20:22
obligation 19:14	original 10:24	personal 14:13	position 4:24	prohibits 42:24
20:4 37:1 38:2	ought 9:3	persons 17:18	5:14 21:22 24:7	prolonged 4:16
obligatory 41:14	outcome 42:23	28:6,21 29:1,8	55:21,22 56:4	proof 37:22
obviously 9:2	outside 12:22	33:8 41:18	Posner 16:5	property 10:7
53:5	17:23	44:25 51:15	possibly 23:25	proposition 4:5,6
occur 16:11	overseas 54:25	pertinence 21:15	post-Nuremberg	26:5 35:23
occurred 6:15	owned 26:16	pertinent 21:8	26:24	proscribe 17:11
odious 46:1	0 WIICU 20.10	Petitioners 1:6	practically 36:10	prosecuted
offend 47:20	P	1:18,21 2:4,8	practice 27:11	35:15,16,17,24
offense 46:25	P 3:1	2:14 3:8 15:11	51:8,9	prosecutions
48:2	page 2:2 3:20	27:8 30:25	prece 36:12	34:15
offenses 3:22	28:14,16 34:1	34:10 35:20	preceded 35:12	Protection 29:6
25:7 26:24 28:7	34:11	48:15 52:6	precedent 13:22	52:25
28:9 29:5 34:5	pages 6:25 34:3	Petroleum 1:8	36:12,13 53:2	proved 9:7
	1	i cu vicum 1.0	30.12,13 33.2	proveu 3.7

				0:
provide 14:19	49:3 50:5	46:21 47:18	respectfully 38:3	6:9 8:14 9:12
41:13 44:19	questions 4:8	refers 24:10 33:9	38:20 40:3,22	15:6 20:25 21:7
provided 10:6	15:5 37:11,12	refuge 12:23	42:19 47:13,21	21:21,24 24:20
18:10 41:23	37:13,15,15	13:5	51:6	29:10 52:2
provides 8:16	41:3	refute 4:4	respondeat	54:18,23 55:9
32:1 50:6	quick 52:8	refutes 41:15	15:20,23 16:2	56:12
providing 9:8	quotes 28:16	regard 9:17	16:10 34:18	Rome 31:13 40:6
provoke 47:1		regardless 8:16	38:24 39:17	40:6 41:15 49:7
public 28:5,24	R	15:16	40:17	49:9,10,11,15
pumping 37:21	R 3:1	regime 34:24	Respondents	49:20
punishable 46:1	raised 8:20 11:8	regulating 56:7	1:23 2:11 3:14	Royal 1:8 3:4
46:4	11:10	rejected41:15	4:21 5:13 7:11	rubric 7:13
punished 28:23	range 52:20	41:19 42:7	11:9,9,19 24:24	rule 23:24 46:6
punitive 39:13	rationale 33:10	44:23 49:16,19	26:7 34:2	51:12,17,20
purpose 47:2	43:9	49:20,25	Respondent's	rulers 28:24
put 11:13	reach 51:6	rejects 46:16,16	33:25	ruling 15:15 51:7
puts 41:21	read 28:19,19	related 19:17,17	response 13:4	running 16:17
puts +1.21	33:5 38:7 49:4	relevant 19:1	responsibility	Tuning 10.17
Q	49:6,7,15	28:16,25	3:22 40:4	S
question 5:1 6:1	reading 4:3 15:1	rem 26:9	responsible 8:9	S 1:19 2:1,6 3:1
7:5,9,16 8:22	realize 44:25	remaining 52:3	16:4,17 28:23	15:9
8:25 11:12	really 8:21,24	remedial 16:25	38:16 39:21	safe 13:8
12:20 13:15	11:17 12:15	37:3,24 43:15	restatement	satisfies 19:18
14:25 16:25	14:20 16:2 19:9	remedies 9:9	38:22 39:2	save 42:21
17:1,5,6,7	45:1	37:4 39:7 54:5	restrict 53:4	saw 13:25
18:24 19:1,3,4	reason 23:17	remedy 37:8	restriction 54:9	saying 4:14
19:8,10,12 20:2	24:5 26:18 33:6	38:17 39:8,11	rests 30:24	19:23 34:3 41:6
20:2,3,4,5,8,20	43:11 46:5	39:14 41:2 42:4	Revolution	43:17,22 44:9
22:21,23 23:1	reasoning 41:9		12:16	45:17,22 48:18
23:10,12,16	reasons 11:4	42:6 46:8 51:14		49:5 53:17
24:8,11,16 25:3	33:23 34:7,22	55:13	right 15:5 19:25	says 3:21,24 9:7
25:4 27:4,25	42:7 45:25 52:9	renewed 25:4	23:9 24:2 25:25	19:16 25:18
28:1,13 29:11	52:22 54:17	representative	31:17,22 32:20	28:21 37:17
30:3,20 32:1,11	REBUTTAL	47:10 48:18	33:10,12 43:7	39:18 41:25
32:16,17 33:4	2:12 52:5	49:18	rights 3:13 4:1	45:25 46:10
33:12 36:6,22	recall 10:20	representing	4:14,18 6:23,24	47:19,23 48:12
36:25 37:1,2,3	recognize 3:21	47:8	11:20 25:7	Scalia 17:14 18:5
37:7,7,22,23	5:9 43:20	require 16:16	26:24 28:7,9	18:13 20:14,19
37:24 38:1,2,4	recognized 43:24	reserve 15:2,5	29:4 34:5,14	31:3,6,7 44:18
, ,	red3:20	residences 14:3	35:1 48:19 50:4	55:21 56:3
38:5,15,17,20 38:24 40:16,19	red 3:20 redress 54:19	resident 6:17	50:7,12 51:21	Scheffer 34:10
		residents 8:6,7	52:21	
40:23 42:3,5,5	55:5	resolved 14:6	Rio 51:4	49:16,17
42:14,20,23	redressed 54:14	resolving 23:8	rise 22:8	scholarship
44:5,6,13,14	reference 24:15	respect 5:4 17:21	robbery 53:24	10:22
44:16,22 45:4	referred 26:21	55:7,16,17	ROBERTS 3:3	scope 19:19 37:8
	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				6
	G		10.11.17.7	
screen41:21	Skinner 43:4	special 48:17	49:11,15,20	51:3
sea 53:24	45:24	specific 18:5	52:19,20 53:4	suggest 10:23
seas 10:22 29:25	Skinner's 53:21	26:21 41:13	53:18,20 54:16	19:8 47:22
46:1	slave 26:11	specifically	statutes 31:13	55:15
second 12:8	slavery 32:21,22	10:20 27:20	41:16	suggested 11:5
13:22 41:21,22	33:17,20	48:2	statutory 44:20	16:6
43:1	Smith 26:7	specify 46:12	45:6,11	suggesting 55:1
sections 40:7	Solicitor 1:19	spoke 44:21	step41:12,18,22	55:4
see 23:20 25:20	somebody 12:25	stakeholders	stop 46:23,25	suing 20:23
32:21 49:2	22:1 27:17	34:23	Story 26:6	50:18,21
seize 26:9,11,12	sorry 14:23	standard 40:11	straightforward	suit 8:15,17 14:1
26:14	16:23 21:1	40:12	24:8	18:21 29:6
seized 27:3	28:18 40:6	start 4:13 12:8	streets 13:24	31:16 32:5
seizes 21:11	54:18	state 14:18 15:18	14:1	43:19,21 47:12
senior 40:14	sort 54:20	18:25,25 20:7	striking 11:17	54:21,24
sense 9:25 10:14	Sosa 13:12,19	21:25,25 35:2	strong 33:15	suits 51:22
sent 10:24	18:23 19:16,18	36:10 37:14	stronger53:2	Sullivan 1:22
sentence 11:16	26:21 37:17	51:23	suable 27:3	2:10 24:22,23
separate 31:24	40:23 41:12,21	statement 11:17	subject 18:2	24:25 25:11,23
separating 36:23	41:25 42:10,12	12:11 21:21	42:12 47:12	26:2,6,20 27:13
series 6:25	44:8	45:11	submission	27:23 29:19
serve 22:10	SOTOMAYOR	states 1:1,14,21	55:10	30:5,12,18,24
serving 22:9	15:19 52:9	2:7 4:24 7:2,9	submit 40:22	31:5,9,18,23
Seventh 16:5	sought 16:12	8:8 9:7,14	submitted 56:13	32:7,14 33:3,18
Shell's 3:17	sounds 13:9,11	11:23 12:1,4,18	56:15	34:21 35:10
shielded 53:2	source 25:5 26:1	12:23,24 13:2,3	subsequent	36:5 37:10,25
ship 21:11 26:9	26:4 29:4 31:11	13:23 15:10	35:25	38:3,19 40:2
26:12,15 27:3	41:23 50:14	17:23 18:1	substance 41:2	41:10 42:9,18
45:25	52:11,11	22:15,20 23:2	42:5 44:13	43:5,16 44:4,8
ships 26:11	sources 18:20	30:9,22 31:19	substantive 19:2	46:9 47:5,13
shot 48:6	48:9 49:2,5	47:10,10,14,21	19:5,13 20:4	48:8,21,23 49:4
show 27:9,11	sovereign 17:22	47:23 49:12	23:14 27:25	49:7,15 50:2,11
30:25 31:1	17:24 18:1,2,6	statute 3:14 6:20	33:21 36:25	50:15,20 51:19
51:15	18:8,20,22	7:4 8:23 9:10	37:15 38:2,17	superior 15:21
shows 51:13	20:15,18,24	9:23 10:1,6	38:21 51:16	15:23 16:3,10
side 11:13 23:20	sovereigns 17:16	12:2,9 14:8,16	sue 12:17,17	34:19 38:24
Sierra 9:24 10:8	17:18,21	14:18 15:16	13:23 23:24	39:17 40:8,17
11:3	sovereignty 47:1	18:10,16 20:12	26:16 29:16,20	supplant 48:3,5
signatories 34:8	sovereign's 18:9	21:3 22:5,8	30:17,23 52:13	supplement 48:2
silent 49:2	speak 27:24	24:19 29:13,17	52:15	supplemental
similar 9:16	28:10 29:1 30:3	30:11 31:4,14	sued 19:21 20:18	52:11
Similarly 45:13	47:15	32:9 34:7 38:8	21:18 22:7,16	support 34:10
simple 34:19	speaking 14:6	40:6,6 41:15	23:13,18 30:11	35:20,21
simply 47:22	speaks 28:4,6	42:14 43:15	30:22 37:18,24	supporting 1:21
49:2 50:24	29:2	48:1 49:8,9,10	38:4 43:14 44:5	2:8 15:11
.,		1012 1010,7,20		

	i	İ	i	İ
suppose 22:13	10:1,15,19 11:1	22:5,8 24:15,16	17:20 31:24	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$
39:17	11:14 12:11,15	24:17 29:17	33:14 34:1	v 1:7 3:4 8:9,10
suppression 28:3	12:19,19 13:2,2	30:11 38:6,13	35:19 45:15	26:7 36:1 43:4
Supreme 1:1,14	16:1 17:9,10	38:16 39:2	48:3	45:8
23:2	18:4,7 19:9,12	42:14 43:6	typical 39:17	various 7:2 33:23
sure 10:14 46:23	20:10,11 21:19	46:10 52:18,20		Venice 1:17
surveyed21:5	23:22,25 24:9	53:4,18,20,22	U	verb 38:7
system 23:5	24:11,15 25:16	53:23 54:4,4	underlying 5:17	versus 39:10
54:13 55:6,7,7	25:19 26:18	tortfeasor 8:8	8:5	viable 13:13
	27:13 32:20	torts 8:3,9 14:19	understand	vicarious 17:2
T	33:9,14 34:18	24:11 53:21	17:15 20:15	36:23 37:6
T 2:1,1	38:21 39:20	torture 3:15,17	22:20 42:10	victim 13:25 29:6
take 5:13 12:23	40:3 42:4 44:6	4:16 21:12,16	undertaking 21:9	52:25
22:4,5,7 30:5	44:16 45:1	29:2,5 33:20	unified 23:3	victims 3:18
36:22 47:5	46:25 47:7,11	48:4 49:23	uniform 46:15	12:16
taken7:6 30:7	48:5 53:16 56:1	52:25	51:8,8	view3:14 22:15
35:9 47:7 48:16	56:6,11	torturers 13:8	unique 6:20 32:9	22:19
55:3	thinking 17:2	track 55:24	32:9,10	viewed36:10
takes 54:25	43:8 44:2	trading 26:11	United 1:1,14,20	50:25 52:11
Talisman 51:4	thinks 46:14	trafficking 22:14	2:7 4:24 5:22	56:7
talk 27:15	thought 6:12	transitory 8:3,11	7:8,21 8:8 9:7	views 53:19
talking 8:11	13:12,14 23:12	treated 33:23	9:14 11:23 12:1	violate 20:9 21:9
13:14 17:7	35:8 45:14	55:25	12:4,18,23,24	43:10 51:16
21:25	49:24 54:20	treaties 27:10	13:2,3,23 15:10	55:20 56:9
tell 34:17	threshold 32:18	33:11	17:23 18:1	violated 13:6
tension 12:4,6	ti 46:25	treatment 11:6	22:14,20 23:2	17:4 53:12
term 29:8 44:24	time 6:4 9:17	treaty 22:7	30:9,22 31:19	violates 21:12
terms 6:21 8:5	15:2,5 21:3	trial 41:3	47:10,10,14,21	42:16
9:22	22:11 24:18	tribunal 35:15,24	47:23 53:11	violating 3:13
territories 41:8	29:3 44:21 51:2	48:14	universal 3:25	22:7 53:14
territory 10:8	56:11	tribunals 5:13	41:13 43:24	violation 12:21
11:2	Tinto 51:5	6:5 35:13 36:1	unnecessarily	13:1 14:20
terrorism 28:4	today 6:5 13:15	tried4:25 22:10	23:23	19:20 22:11
Thank 15:6	24:19 47:15,23	troubled 11:6	urge 51:6,19	32:3 33:2 37:9
24:20 52:1,2,4	told 47:11 54:20	true 16:15 32:8	use 29:7,14,14	37:22 38:6,9,13
56:12	tomorrow31:6	36:22 53:10	uses 6:5 20:12	46:11 53:23
they'd 25:16	44:19	trying 4:4	usually 16:16	54:15
thing 14:11 20:20	tort 3:14 6:20,22	Tuesday 1:11	U.K 34:1 41:5,9	violations 5:25
41:11 49:4	7:4 8:5,11,13	turns 3:20	45:16	6:14,22 10:3
51:12 52:24	8:23 9:9,22	TVPA 44:23 45:2	U.N 48:15,16,17	11:20 23:13
54:14,20	10:6 12:2,8	47:22,24,25	48:24	28:3 34:5 50:7
things 8:21 48:3	13:14 14:15,16	48:6 52:10,14	U.S 6:17 8:6,6	50:12 51:21
54:11 56:8	14:18 15:16	52:18 53:6	10:5 22:14,15	52:21
think 4:21 6:2 7:9	16:16 18:1,16	two 5:22 6:18	26:7 35:25 36:1	
7:13,20,22 9:6	20:12,12 21:3,6	8:20 15:25	45:3	W
			<u> </u>	

walking 13:24,25	46:24	3		
want 14:24 15:2	written27:14	$\frac{3}{32:4}$		
22:25 24:5 27:6	wrong 4:22 5:21	30 41:24		
30:15 38:11	15:17 39:19	30 41:24		
49:4	wrongful 32:6	4		
wanted 12:16	45:11	46 35:25		
13:3	43.11	40 33.23		
war 5:18 36:8	X	5		
46:23,25 47:1	x 1:2,9	5 52:3		
53:15		52 2:14		
Washington 1:10	Y			
1:20	year 35:14	9		
wasn't 42:15	York 1:22,22	9 35:11		
49:25	9:17 13:25 14:1	96 26:17		
way 6:20,21	1			
10:10 20:23	10-1491 1:5 3:4			
23:3,8 30:8	10:02 1:15 3:2			
40:17 44:2 45:8	11 34:3			
45:23 53:4 54:9	11:04 56:14			
54:16 55:3	12 11:18 26:8			
ways 55:19 56:1	1350 6:13			
weak 48:6	15 2:7 34:3			
went 10:23 22:9	1666 43:6		•	
We'll 3:3	17 3:20 26:17			
we're 17:7 27:6	34:1			
43:13 55:17	1774 8:10			
we've 9:2 11:4	1795 9:21 29:22			
29:9	18 6:25 26:17			
whatsoever 12:1	34:11			
win 27:8	18th 25:16			
won 26:19	1907 22:5			
wonder 40:25	1945 35:12,25			
word 20:12 29:14	1992 11:21			
29:14	1995 11:21			
words 17:3 19:5	1998 34:7 49:8			
39:1 54:23				
work 21:24 40:21	2			
world 3:24 7:2,10	20 18:24 19:16			
22:16 23:3 25:6	19:24 28:14,16			
32:1 33:22	37:16 40:23			
34:13 37:20	2007 48:17			
39:9,20 40:3,11	2012 1:11			
43:22 50:6,8	22 6:25			
51:10 54:13,19	24 2:11			
wouldn't 27:2	28 1:11 35:4			